

VOLUME XV

NOVEMBER, 1929

NUMBER 7

# BULLETIN

OF

## THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING  
OKLAHOMA A. AND M. COLLEGE  
CALIFORNIA PENSION REPORT  
TULANE LETTER ON COURSES IN EDUCATION

PUBLISHED BY  
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; PAUL KAUFMAN;  
JOSEPH MAYER; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*

26 JACKSON PLACE  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September

---

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at  
Easton, Pa., under the act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Notes and Announcements

Annual Meeting.....	504
Report of Nominating Committee.....	505
Constitutional Amendment.....	505
Calendar Simplification.....	506
Public Utilities.....	507
Rockefeller Foundation.....	510
Engineering Education.....	511

### Academic Freedom and Tenure, Report of

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.....	513
---	-----

### Reviews

Salaries and Teaching Loads, <i>W. J. Freed</i> .....	520
Am I Getting an Education? <i>S. Eddy</i> .....	523

### Educational Discussion

The Convention of Going to College, <i>W. I. Nichols</i> .....	527
Quality versus Quantity in University Faculties, <i>Y. Henderson</i> .....	532
Some Responsibilities of the U. S. Office of Education, <i>W. J. Cooper</i> .....	534
A Dream of Fair Education, <i>A. M. Brooks</i> .....	535
Salary Scales of Trained Men and Women, <i>R. H. True</i> ....	538
A Curriculum Questionnaire, <i>L. R. Marston</i> .....	542

### Local and Chapter Notes

Antioch, Comprehensive Examinations.....	544
California, Pensions.....	544
Chicago, Convocation Address.....	550
College of the City of New York, Salary Schedules and Schedule Conditions.....	553
Purdue, Student Rating of Instructors.....	556
Tulane, Proposal for Investigating Value of Professional Courses in Education.....	558

TABLE OF CONTENTS

503

Membership

Nominations for Membership.....	563
---------------------------------	-----

Appointment Service

Vacancies Reported.....	567
Teachers Available.....	568

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

## NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNUAL MEETING.—The sixteenth annual meeting will be held at Duke University, Durham, and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Saturday, December 28, 1929 to Monday, December 30, 1929 in connection with the American Historical Association.

The headquarters for the meeting will be the Washington Duke Hotel, Durham, North Carolina. The meeting on December 28 will be at the Washington Duke Hotel and the meeting on December 30 will be at Chapel Hill, probably at the Carolina Inn.

A reduction of one and one-half fare on the "Certificate Plan" will be available for members from all points in the country provided not less than 150 certificates are presented.

Tickets should be purchased to Durham and not to Chapel Hill for which Durham is the railroad station.

A certificate in the name of the American Association of University Professors or the American Historical Association must be obtained with the ticket.

The program of the meeting is expected to include, on Saturday, December 28, reports on Ethics, Academic Freedom and Tenure, Student Health, Library Service and Copyright, and Cooperation with Latin-American Universities. The afternoon session will include addresses on the work of the American Bar Association and the American Medical Society by distinguished representatives of these two bodies and it is hoped that arrangements can be made for a profitable discussion of the recent report by the Carnegie Foundation on College Athletics.

The Monday session at Chapel Hill will be devoted to reports on Pensions and Insurance, on the development of the Washington Office, and the new Appointment Service, with miscellaneous business. Particular attention is also called to the communication from the Tulane Chapter (elsewhere in this issue) in connection with the anticipated discussion, at this session of Required Courses in Education. The *Bulletin* gladly gives space to this communication as a stimulating contribution to the discussion of this important question. It is particularly hoped that chapters will arrange for local consideration of this subject and of the report on College Athletics between now and the annual meeting in order that the discussion at that time may be more completely representative. Reference may also be made to the report presented at the last annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges, March *Bulletin*, p. 170.



The editorial board of the *Bulletin* will welcome brief communications on any matters of general interest for publication in future issues.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOMINATE OFFICERS

*For President*, W. B. Munro, Government, Harvard.

*For Vice-President*, Hardin Craig, English, Stanford.

*For Vice-President*, J. S. Guy, Chemistry, Emory.

*For Secretary*, H. W. Tyler, Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

*For Treasurer*, Joseph Mayer, Economics, Tufts.

Members of the Council (term expiring January 1, 1932).

J. H. Breasted, Egyptology, Chicago.

J. P. W. Crawford, Romance Language, Pennsylvania.

G. W. Cunningham, Philosophy, Cornell.

Paul Emerson, Agriculture, Iowa State.

Yandell Henderson, Physiology, Yale.

L. L. Hendren, Physics, Georgia.

Buford Johnson, Psychology, Johns Hopkins.

F. L. Paxson, History, Wisconsin.

Louise Pound, English, Nebraska.

B. J. Vos, German, Indiana.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.—The following is recommended by the Council for adoption by the Association at the annual meeting:

#### Article III—Officers.

1. The officers of the Association shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a General Secretary, an Executive Secretary, a Treasurer, and thirty elective members of the Council together with members of the Council *ex-officio* as provided in Section 4. The term of office of the President, the Vice-Presidents, and the General Secretary shall be two years, subject to the provision of Section 3 of this Article.

3. The President, the Vice-President, the General Secretary, and the elective members of the Council shall be elected by a majority vote of members present and voting at the annual meeting. The Executive Secretary and the Treasurer shall be elected by the Council. . . .

6. The Executive Secretary shall be the general executive officer of the Association. He will be responsible for the management of its work under the general direction of the Officers and the Council.

**CALENDAR SIMPLIFICATION.**—The report of the National Committee to the Secretary of State is a pamphlet of 120 pages, giving a careful account of the organization of the committee, its method of procedure and conclusions. "After a year of investigation the National Committee considers that the requisite conditions exist to justify the participation of this government in an International Conference to provide for the simplification of the calendar. These conditions are:

1. The prevalence of a demand for calendar improvement on the part of a large and representative body of American opinion.
2. A growing recognition by the general public of the grave defects of the present calendar, a lively interest in the methods by which these can be overcome, and an intelligent understanding of the principles of calendar reform.
3. The actual experience of many business concerns with the use of private simplified calendars to secure more accurate accounting in their business affairs, and their practically unanimous judgment in favor of the general simplification of the civil calendar.

"In view of the foregoing and owing to the early approach of the year 1933 (when January 1 falls on Sunday), the most convenient year until 1939 for putting the new calendar into effect, the Committee expresses the hope that an International conference will soon be assembled, and that this government will in the near future indicate to the nations of the world its willingness to participate in such a conference.

"Although our Committee finds that opinion in this country relative to the best plan of calendar change preponderantly favors the 13-month fixed calendar (described in this report), it does not recommend that representatives of the United States Government should enter an International Conference committed to this plan or any other. It believes that international discussion of the question should be approached with an open mind and with due regard to the opinion of all religious bodies in so far as they may be concerned, as well as to divergent opinions based on practical considerations. From such discussion a satisfactory plan of simplification ought reasonably to emerge, designed to serve as a universal calendar." . . .

"The Committee bases its conclusions on the results of a survey which it has conducted during a year. This survey included:

1. An analysis of the defects of the present calendar and the inconveniences it imposes upon modern life;

2. A study: (a) of the history of, and changes in, the present calendar; (b) of the movement for calendar reform in this and other countries; (c) of the reports of different international and national bodies which have given consideration to the question and of the various methods of calendar change advocated by interested groups and individuals in this and other countries, including the comprehensive report of the Special Committee of Inquiry into the Reform of the Calendar, appointed by the League of Nations; (d) of the experience of business concerns with private calendars; (e) of the religious aspects of calendar change; (f) of other current calendars;

3. The collection and examination of the evidence of previous investigations and information on the subject in this country and of opinion that had been expressed thereon;

4. The collection and examination of evidence of the consideration and discussion of the subject in the press, at meetings, conventions and other gatherings, in schools and colleges, in the pulpit, on the lecture platform and over the radio, also at Congressional hearings; and in the voluminous correspondence received by the Committee."

The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, in transmitting the report writes in part: "The report impresses me as a comprehensive survey of the public sentiment in the United States on the reform of the calendar. It seems the time is near at hand when the adoption of one simple universal calendar by all the nations of the earth will confer important benefits upon all humanity and our posterity. I believe that the efforts of this Department to perform its functions in the fields of science, agriculture, and meteorology would be materially promoted and facilitated under a better calendar than the one now in use. I also believe that the United States is justified in forwarding this report to the League of Nations, in response to its request."

**PUBLIC UTILITIES.**—A summary of the extent of instruction in public utilities in colleges and universities has been recently published by the National Electric Light Association. It is stated in the Foreword, signed by the sixteen educational members<sup>1</sup> of the Committee on Cooperation with Educational Institutions, that "While the investigation of the Federal Trade Commission is still

<sup>1</sup> C. O. Ruggles, Director, Ohio State, Harvard; W. B. Bizzell, Oklahoma; J. C. Bonbright, Columbia; W. E. Cox, Washington; R. T. Ely, Northwestern; H. M. Gray, Illinois; R. E. Heilman, Northwestern; Eliot Jones, Stanford; C. A. Lory, Colorado Agricultural; J. T. Madden, New York Univ.; D. W. Malott, Harvard; L. C. Marshall, Chicago, Johns Hopkins; Anson Marston, Iowa State; C. F. Scott, Yale; I. L. Sharfman, Michigan; H. R. Trumbower, Wisconsin.

incomplete and the Commission has presented no report on its findings, it is apparent that the great diffusion of responsibility among numerous Committees and Information Bureaus which characterize the industry in its educational activities has added to the difficulties of freeing some of these 'educational activities' from the charges of lack of good faith, of improper propaganda, and of practice subversive of the public welfare. Until this situation has been entirely cleared up by the industry, it is not timely for educators to consider definite plans for formal cooperation with the industry in matters concerning the public aspects of the business. With the completion of the Survey, membership on the committee of the representatives of educational institutions who have performed this special service is automatically terminated. In light of the situation to which reference has been made, it is our judgment that future cooperation, aside from that involving technical phases of both business and engineering, will be most effective both from the standpoint of the higher educational institutions and of the industry if conducted by a committee or committees composed entirely of representatives of the industry such as obtains in many other national trade and industrial organizations. Under such a plan, the utilities will have the utmost freedom in presenting their own point of view and in indicating the extent of their ability and willingness to cooperate in the study and discussion of the public aspects of the industry. Such an arrangement will enable educators to cooperate with those committees of the industry whose educational activities and scope of proposed cooperation are of such a character as to merit cooperation.

"In view of the fact that this report may be of some interest not only to educators whose special subjects were included in the Survey but also to those interested in the general problems of the coordination of college curricula and in the relation of college curricula to employee education it is suggested that the report be made available within the field of education, not only to those whose special fields are represented in the report, but also to the membership of the American Association of University Professors, which includes all fields of higher education."

The survey attempted to determine: "(1) The extent to which there is a study of public utilities in college and university courses. (2) The character and extent of the industry's demand for college trained personnel. (3) The character of the opportunities open to college trained personnel in the industry. (4) The willingness and

ability of the industry to cooperate with colleges and universities.

The conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

"1. In light of the fact that the new field of utilities other than railroads has developed at a very rapid pace within the past decade, there is urgent need for a more intelligent understanding of public utility problems both on the part of those engaged in the business and on the part of the public.

"2. In view of the fact that the utilities other than railroads are now absorbing an increasing number of college graduates, there might well be some consideration on the part of colleges and universities of more adequate instruction (not necessarily more courses) in this field. The business administration aspects of the industry deserve careful study. Careful study should be given to the possibilities for more effective coordination of curricula in Engineering and Business. The needs of graduate students in Engineering and in Law for courses in Economics and Business Administration deserve careful consideration. A limited number of educational institutions ought to consider the problem of more adequate provision for short courses during the summer or at other times of the year for men who have had a number of years' experience in the industry.

"3. The industry would do well to consider possible improvement in the type of field experience and employment available to undergraduates.

"4. The industry might well consider plans for making available a larger number of its most *competent men* who could respond to invitations from the Schools of Engineering and Schools of Business to give lectures on various phases of the industry before college students and to participate in conferences and discussions on utility problems.

"5. The industry might advantageously give more attention to the problem of its selection of college men through recruiting, and to participation in conferences on vocational guidance to which a number of higher educational institutions are beginning to give attention.

"6. The industry would doubtless find it worth while to make a very careful study of employee education for college graduates including possible improvement in the mode of carrying on its correspondence courses. Careful study of employee education should lead to a more effective coordination of such instruction with that of the colleges and universities; to a reduction in labor turnover; to in-



creasing the efficiency of its employees and to making some provision for discovering men in its organization who possess executive ability.

"7. The utilities other than railroads should consider the establishment of a centralized bureau, similar to the Bureau of Railway Economics, for the collection and dissemination of statistical, factual, and other objective data including such information on inter-corporate and inter-utility relationships as has been indicated in this chapter. This information should be comprehensive and reliable, and it should be made available for the study of public utility problems. If the industry expects full cooperation from colleges and universities in the study of the public aspects of the industry, it must cooperate fully with the members of faculties of these institutions who make thorough studies of such utility problems. This procedure is necessary to make the courses of more value in the training of men for the utility industry and is imperative if a true picture of the broad economic aspects of public utility problems is to be given. It is the conviction of this committee that cooperation in the study and discussion of some of the public aspects of the industry will not be worth while unless some such provision for comprehensive data as is here suggested is feasible."

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION.—The President's report for 1928 gives an account of the recent reorganization of four Rockefeller Boards. "The essential features were, (1) the merging of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial into a new corporation to be known as the Rockefeller Foundation, which should assume all the assets and liabilities of the two boards; (2) the extension of the scope of the new Foundation's activities to include not only public health but the advancement of knowledge in the medical sciences, in the natural sciences (taking over the foreign program of the International Education Board), in the social sciences (heretofore administered by the Memorial), and in the humanities; (3) the administration of the public health activities of the Foundation through an International Health Division with a group of seven scientific directors; (4) the appointment of a director with necessary assistants for each of the fields—the natural sciences, the medical sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities; (5) a clearly defined division of labor between the General Education Board and the Foundation through frequent conferences of the officers; (6) the incorporation of a China Medical Board, with independent self-perpetuating trustees,

to which the lands and buildings in Peking, together with endowment funds and annual appropriations, should be given. From this reorganization two large and well-endowed Rockefeller boards emerge: the General Education Board, with a Federal charter which limits expenditures to the United States, and the Rockefeller Foundation, incorporated under the general laws of New York State. The book value of the combined resources of the new Rockefeller Foundation will be more than \$203,000,000, with outstanding obligations of \$35,000,000. It is worth noting that since their founding the four Rockefeller Boards have not only distributed all their incomes but have appropriated \$225,000,000 of capital funds." . . .

"For several years the Rockefeller Foundation has supported fellowships in medical education and research, in public health, in nursing education, in the physical and biological sciences. Fellowships which aim at advanced training for the promotion of teaching and research have been largely turned over to other agencies to administer, while the Foundation has retained direct control of fellowships designed to prepare men and women for specified positions in medical schools, schools of nursing, and government health departments and institutions with which cooperation is going on." . . .

"On the whole, the results of the fellowship plan have been highly satisfactory. The traveling fellowships which are under the immediate control of the Foundation are almost without exception used to prepare health officers, medical teachers and investigators, instructors in nursing, and public health nurses for specific positions guaranteed in advance in their own countries. Although the program has been in force only a few years the results, notably in certain countries, have been gratifying. Returned fellows occupy positions of influence; a few have already gained posts of recognized leadership. While fellowships are never granted for the purpose of promoting better international relations but always in the interests of specific projects of public health or medical education, there are undoubtedly by-products of mutual insight, friendliness, and a sense of international comradeship in serving a common cause."

ENGINEERING EDUCATION.—Bulletin 16, Of the Investigation of Engineering Education is a comparative study of engineering education in the United States and in Europe by Dr. William E. Wickenden, now president of the Case School of Applied Science. An account of the historic development of engineering education in leading countries

is followed by a detailed discussion of engineering education in France, of higher technical education in England and Scotland, and in Central Europe. It is stated that the more general findings and recommendations will be published separately.



## ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE A

OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE.—At the request of Professor A. S. Hiatt an investigation was conducted April 19-20, 1929, at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, regarding the failure to reappoint him as associate professor of history in June, 1928. When the committee arrived, Dr. Henry G. Bennett, the President, was out of the city, but Dr. C. H. McElroy, Dean of the College of Science and Literature, welcomed it and did all that could be asked to facilitate the investigation. That night President Bennett arrived and went out of his way to serve the committee. All, with possibly one or two exceptions, who appeared were desirous of contributing what they could. The committee also went to Oklahoma City to interview Mr. H. B. Cordell, the President of the Board, and found him equally agreeable and willing to cooperate. They also made an effort to see Mrs. Ferne King, apparently the most active member of the Board, but she was out of the city. A letter addressed to her, asking certain questions concerning the dismissal of Professor Hiatt, has not been answered. In order that the reader may understand this case it will be necessary to explain conditions then prevailing in the institution.

The Board of Agriculture is the governing board of the college and other agricultural schools. The president of the Board is elected by popular vote for a term of four years. The four other members are appointed by the governor for a similar term but so arranged that only one term shall expire each year. Yet the governor has the power to remove all the appointive members at once. This has not been done lately, and some of the members have served more than four years. The Board meets for a two-day session the first of every month.

The administrative officers, including the President, and the faculty are elected annually and receive a new contract every year. The election usually takes place at the June meeting. Several months before June, 1928, it was known that President Knapp would not ask for re-election. However, he and Dr. C. H. McElroy, Dean of the College of Science and Literature and acting President in the absence of the President, prepared a list of the active faculty members to be laid before the Board. No written recommendations were made to the Dean by the heads of the departments, but testimony which the

committee thought trustworthy showed that Professor T. H. Reynolds, the head of the department of history, gave an oral recommendation to Dean McElroy for the reappointment of Professor Hiatt. The faculty list, with Professor Hiatt's name on it, was taken to Oklahoma City by President Knapp and Dean McElroy and laid before the Board June 1, apparently without comment or recommendation. The next day the Board elected Dr. Henry G. Bennett president in place of Dr. Knapp, and then, according to the minutes of the Board, President Bennett read the faculty list as left by President Knapp and Dean McElroy.

It seems that the Board had agreed, somewhat informally, that when the faculty list was read, any name on the list to which any member of the Board objected should be dropped. This information was given to the committee by Mr. Cordell, the President of the Board. The committee could not find out exactly who originated this idea and why it was adopted, but apparently Mrs. Ferne King was responsible for it. When the list was finished it was found that the names of seven members of the faculty, of one administrative officer, and of the college physician had been stricken out, most of them on the objection of Mrs. King.

So far as the committee could learn not one had been given any intimation of what was coming. Two of those dropped, one of whom was an instructor in history, soon found employment elsewhere. One was restored and given a year's leave of absence on half pay for study and will be taken back on the faculty, if he desires to return. All the others except Professor Hiatt were restored, directly or indirectly, to the college with some readjustments as to positions. This was done after Dr. Bennett took up his duties as President on July 1.

It seems that Professor Hiatt did not immediately raise the question of reinstatement with President Bennett, who had never met him. This was largely due to critical illness in his family. Meantime two new men had been recommended by Professor Reynolds and Dean McElroy. These names were passed on to the Board by President Bennett and the men were duly elected.

President Bennett explained carefully to the committee his policy on appointment. In case a dean is to be appointed he will look for the man. In case a vacancy in a department is to be filled, he expects the head of the department and the dean of the college to agree on the man. Any recommendation they make he will pass on to the Board.

No charges were filed with the Board against Professor Hiatt.

When he asked for an investigation by the American Association of University Professors, Professor H. W. Tyler, secretary of the Association, finally secured from Mr. Cordell, the President of the Board, a statement of the reasons for dropping Professor Hiatt. The reasons given were:

"1. That Professor Hiatt cherished a grudge against another professor which caused him to refuse credentials to that Professor's wife although her academic record was excellent.

"2. That Professor Hiatt's attitude toward Dr. Reynolds was insubordinate; that he tried in many ways to embarrass Dr. Reynolds; and that in combination with Professor Campbell, he attempted to intimidate Dr. Reynolds.

"3. That immediately after the Board had refused to reappoint Professor Hiatt, he tried to launch public propaganda against the Board for the purpose of obtaining a reversal of the decision."

The main facts in regard to the first charge except as to the "grudge" appear to have been undisputed. Professor Hiatt was convinced that a member of his class had cheated on an examination and gave her an F. When considerable difficulty was raised by the student, the head of the department, Professor T. H. Reynolds, declined to interfere and Dean McElroy sustained Professor Hiatt, but President Knapp finally ordered another examination by an instructor not in the department of history and the student was given a passing grade. So far as the committee was able to learn, the matter was then dropped by the student concerned, but the incident had been talked about a good deal and came to the Board.

As to the second charge: One individual examined by the committee said that Professor Hiatt had manifested a spirit of insubordination and at times was disobedient to orders and cited a few cases to illustrate. Apparently the one on which most emphasis was laid was the failure to attend certain chapel services as requested by the Dean. Over against this alleged insubordination may be set a quotation from a letter of recommendation written by Professor Reynolds under date of January 15, 1929:

"I have found Mr. Hiatt to be courteous, loyal to his department, and loyal to the best interests of the college. His attitude is that of subordination to those above him in authority. He is cooperative and conscientiously performs all duties assigned to him."

Mr. Cordell's letter contained no reference to charges of incapacity, but in a conversation with the committee Professor Hiatt indicated

that something of that kind had gone to the Board. In his examination before the committee Professor Reynolds said that he "seemed to have difficulty in presenting the material," that he "had difficulty in getting it over," that some students refused to register for his courses. Other instructors in the college testified that they considered him of about the average capacity, that some students liked him and some did not. Two of his former students who are now employed by the college said that they had found his instruction very satisfactory and thought that he was particularly good in advanced work.

As for the third charge, that he had started propaganda against the Board after his dismissal, this could have had nothing to do with his dismissal. If true, it might have had something to do with the failure to reinstate him, but the committee found nothing to sustain the charge.

In a very frank conversation with the committee President Bennett and Dean McElroy both admitted that Professor Hiatt had suffered a grievous wrong, and said that they wanted to right that wrong, if a way could be found without committing another wrong. Apparently they had in mind the man who had come to take his place. Mr. Cordell, also, expressed a desire to see the wrong righted. In view of this the committee addressed a letter to Professor Reynolds and laid these facts before him. They also suggested that a beginning could be made by giving Professor Hiatt a place in the summer school, the faculty for which was not then complete. A copy of the letter was sent to Professor Hiatt. About a week later a letter was received from Professor Hiatt saying that he had had a conference with Professor Reynolds and was hopeful of an adjustment. Under date of May 24 Professor Reynolds wrote:

"With reference to your letter of April 25, I regret that my decision passed on Professor Hiatt was definite and final at the time submitted. It was made in good faith and represents my best judgment."

*Findings.*—After reviewing all the evidence they could get, the committee reached the following conclusions:

1. That conditions and procedure in the severance of Professor Hiatt's connection with the faculty of the Oklahoma A. & M. College were entirely contrary to those which the American Association of University Professors believes to be for the welfare of college teach-

ing. He was summarily dismissed, after long service, without warning, without hearing, and late in the academic year.

2. That Professor Reynolds, the head of the Department of History, did not in his conduct of the case sufficiently regard the principles of ethics the American Association of University Professors holds to be incumbent upon a college teacher and a head of a department or school. He gave no intimation to Professor Hiatt of dissatisfaction or impending trouble. He concurred in the recommendation of Professor Hiatt's reappointment. He made no effort, after he learned of the sudden dismissal instead of reappointment, to correct or lessen a grievous wrong done to a colleague and subordinate within the department over whose welfare he was the official guardian. And he made righting the wrong more difficult by precipitate action in recommending appointment of another person to the vacated position. Yet he subsequently gave Professor Hiatt a letter of strong recommendation which he did not wish or intend to be taken at its face value. There is strong evidence tending to show that he attempted to prevent Professor Hiatt from securing another position in Oklahoma. This committee feels, after weighing the evidence, that duplicity is not too strong a word to characterize Professor Reynolds's dealing in Professor Hiatt's case.

3. That Dean McElroy might well have taken advantage of an opportunity to save the College from a bad position, and perhaps a colleague from a serious wrong, by bringing to the attention of the new President the case of Professor Hiatt and the consequences likely to ensue from it, instead of concurring, without comment, in the nomination by Professor Reynolds of another person to fill the vacated position.

4. That President Bennett, who had just entered on his duties, may possibly be considered justified in assuming that the case of Professor Hiatt, if he ever thought of it, was a closed question. He told the committee that he never met him until a month or two after the election of Professor Hiatt's successor. But as he was working for the reinstatement of other men, it would have been only reasonable for him to depart from his general rule about departmental appointments to ask why this man had been dropped.

5. That Mrs. Ferne King, member of the Board, is to be commended for taking an active interest in the college, but that she should have procured information, upon which she advocated Board action, from authoritative sources and those officially responsible for the



conduct of the institution and its departments. Whatever the causes may be, or the real situation, there is a widespread opinion at Stillwater, within and without the faculty, that political and personal influences with board members may determine appointment and tenure of professors. Such suspicions will break down the morale of any faculty and great care should be taken to avoid any apparent justification for them. (Since this report was written Mrs. King's term as a member of the Board has expired, and the governor did not reappoint her.)

6. That the Board is to be commended for following the suggestion of President Bennett and adopting the resolution herewith appended.

#### RESOLUTION

*"Be It Resolved*, that the following statement relative to Academic Tenure be approved:

"The precise terms and expectations of every appointment shall be stated in writing and be in possession of both the college and the teacher.

"Termination of a temporary or short term appointment shall always be possible at the expiration of the term by the mere act of giving timely notice of the desire to terminate. The decision to terminate shall always be taken, however, in conference with the department concerned. The question of appointment for the ensuing academic year shall always be taken up as early as possible.

"Notice of the decision of the Board to terminate a contract shall be given in ample time to allow the teacher an opportunity to secure a new position. The extreme limit of such notice shall not be less than three months before the expiration of the academic year. The teacher who proposes to withdraw shall also be expected to give notice in ample time to enable the institution to make a new appointment.

"A permanent or long term appointment shall not be terminated except for cause, and then only after a proper hearing. Exception to this rule may be necessary in cases of gross immorality or treason when the facts are admitted. In such cases summary dismissal will naturally ensue. In cases where other offenses are charged, and in all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher shall always have the opportunity to face his accuser and be heard in his own de-

fense by the Board or by the committee of the Board that passes judgment upon the case."<sup>1</sup>

But the committee feels that the expressions "temporary or short term" and "permanent or long term" appointments in this Resolution need definition, at least when brought to the attention of outsiders, inasmuch as in the current custom at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College no appointment is for more than a single year.

7. That the administration of the agricultural schools in Oklahoma, and especially of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, would be freed from most of its recurrent embarrassments and troubles if its control were entrusted to a separate Board of Regents instead of to the Board of Agriculture. The Board of Agriculture has charge of a host of activities and agencies, such, for example, as cattle and dairy control, which involve interests very different from those of educational institutions, and which must engage the larger part of its attention. The experience of other states with boards uniting the control of educational institutions with other functions, some of which involve appointments open to political influence, has not been a happy one. The history of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College for some time past, with its rapid succession of presidents, shows the difficulty of securing the uninterrupted development of the College as an educational institution under present methods of control.

D. Y. THOMAS, R. H. GRIFFITH, E. H. HOLLANDS

The above report is approved by the general committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure for publication in the *Bulletin*.

<sup>1</sup> During the examination of the present report by the members of Committee A it has been pointed out that this resolution would be much more satisfactory if in addition to a hearing "by the Board or by a committee of the Board" it had provided for participation by the Faculty in accordance with the principles laid down in the report of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure (1925): "Termination of a permanent or long-term appointment for cause should regularly require action by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the college. . . . In the trial of charges of professional incompetence the testimony of scholars in the same field, either from his own or from other institutions, should always be taken."

ARTHUR L. WHEELER  
Acting Chairman of Committee A

## REVIEWS

A STUDY OF THE SALARIES AND TEACHING LOADS IN THE DENOMINATIONAL 4-YEAR COLLEGES AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES, by William J. Freed.

Desiring to check the practice in his own institution against the common practice of institutions of its type, Professor Freed found difficulty "because of the almost entire lack of data on the subject" of "salaries and teaching loads in denominational colleges." This information he set out to procure; and having procured, has rightly decided to contribute to the public good. Modeling upon similar surveys for state institutions, he has gathered, tabulated, and cautiously interpreted data as to the salaries and teaching loads of all ranks from Assistant to College President in denominational colleges and private junior colleges. Results from junior colleges proved seldom of value, so that we shall omit them from further discussion. Professor Freed's results are tabulated comparatively with those for state institutions, also by sections of the country within the denominational group—Eastern, Southern, Western, Central. There is a study of the relation between salary and teaching load, and another between salaries, teaching loads, and "accreditation."

The conclusions concerning the denominational four-year colleges may well be quoted.

### Specific Conclusions Derived from Studies.

1. State Institutions have the Highest Average Salaries and the Lowest Average Teaching Loads, 4-Year Denominational Colleges come next, and the Private Junior Colleges are last.
2. Teaching Loads vary inversely with Salary. Stated differently it is as follows: As Salaries Increase Teaching Loads tend to Decrease.
3. Teaching Loads are fairly Constant below the rank of Dean.
4. There is a lack of Uniformity in Salary Schedules in 4-Year Denominational Colleges.
5. There is a general Uniformity in Teaching Loads in 4-Year Denominational Colleges.
6. Deans carry approximately three-fourths of the Average Teaching Load in 4-Year Denominational Colleges.
7. In the 4-Year Denominational Colleges the Highest Average Salaries and Lowest Average Teaching Loads are found in



the Eastern and Southern sections, followed by the Western and Central sections.

8. Salaries and Teaching Loads are Factors that should be taken into consideration in the accreditation of Colleges.

General Conclusions Derived from Data.

1. There is a very definite desire and need for information concerning Salaries and Teaching Loads in Denominational Colleges.
2. Denominational lines are not always clearly drawn.
3. Denominational Colleges are not necessarily sectarian in character as used in this work.
4. There seems to be a trend toward more cooperation among Denominational Colleges.
5. The Denominational Colleges are going to have a harder struggle in the future, because of the competition from the Public Junior Colleges from below and the Universities from above.
6. Because of the "pressure" brought to bear upon the Denominational Colleges, both junior and 4-year, to meet University requirements, Salaries and Teaching Loads will tend to improve.
7. There seems to be a tendency for Denominational Colleges to become more independent and more non-sectarian in character.
8. There are a large number of small Denominational Colleges with relatively low salaries and high teaching loads.

The editor's work of compilation and interpretation seems to have been done with reasonable care, and complete candor. His own institution, for instance, ranks very near the bottom by the standards that he unflinchingly sets up. He raises neither hallelujah chorus, nor calamity howl; but accepts the facts as he finds them, and soberly suggests quite obvious needs for improvement. The results will probably surprise no one who is at all conversant with comparative teaching conditions; yet the concreteness of them should put a powerful weapon into the hands of those denominational educators who desire improvement. One hopes, however, that the statistical inferiority of the denominational institutions may not add to the already too great complacency of state institutions.

While Professor Freed has himself exercised reasonable care, yet one fears that his results are too favorable to the denominational college. Only seventy per cent of such colleges responded. It is a pretty fair guess that the silent thirty per cent would not have improved the averages. Of those that did respond, a large number objected to having their names attached to the statistics, and a few refused to permit any information to be published in any form. It would have been of interest to have the grounds for these objections stated.

A greater difficulty is that this type of statistics probably does not measure either the salary or the teaching load in denominational colleges even with what small accuracy it does in state institutions. Professor Freed himself recognized that this was true in Roman Catholic institutions to such an extent as to make statistics of this kind from them valueless. Teachers in Protestant denominational institutions contribute heavily from their small salaries both to the denomination and to the institution. Tithing is a frequent practice among them, and in some instances the tither recognizes only the church as the recipient of the tithe. What he contributes to other causes is over and above the tithe. But the pressure is frequently even more direct. The president may call his faculty to assembled prayer that they may give abundantly, so that he can use their liberality as an example to the general congregation. Probably in such cases the teacher should expect to be more blest in the giving than in the receiving. Or one may be "credibly informed" of an institution which to meet the standards of an accrediting agency raised the salaries of its professors to the minimum required; but the professors in turn contribute to the institution the amount of the "raise." If one takes into consideration the amounts contributed by these teachers in other ways, he will find that they are actually receiving hardly so much as three-fourths of the modest sum at which in the statistics they are rated. One may get a certain grim amusement out of the story of the one professor who had the moral courage to refuse this arrangement on the simple ground that he is worth the full sum. He is.

Even less do the statistics on teaching load give an adequate picture of actual conditions. They give no hint of the hours of time spent in prayerful coaching of individual students that they may not fail; the other hours of acting as adviser and father confessor; and still other hours spent in setting a good example by

attending prayer meeting, Y. M. or Y. W. C. A., teaching Sunday-school, campaigning for prohibition, or for the institution, preaching, etc. These things appear neither on the schedule, nor in the contract—if there were any contract; but the teacher who avoids his full share of them is usually considered not quite the right person. It is the chief merit of such teachers to "give till it hurts," not only of their "resources," but even of their very lives.

Certainly some more adequate system must be invented for measuring both actual salary and actual teaching load, if we are to arrive at any really satisfactory standards in such matters. And this criticism holds good for all types of institutions. It is not enough to know the size of the pay check; it is necessary also to know both the perquisites—if any—and the encumbrances—which are many—upon it. It is not enough to know the number of clock-hours on the schedule; it is necessary to take into consideration all the multifarious—and all too frequently nefarious—activities that occupy the teacher's time.

Yet when the best has been done to measure the mechanics of salary and teaching load, we shall still be far from measuring the most vital thing of all—devoted loyalty to and belief in one's institution and one's profession. It is that loyalty, unmeasured by money or teaching conditions, which is still the greatest asset of the denominational institution. Any denominational campus will furnish but too numerous instances of frail and tattered saints who with all of what little strength is left toil cheerfully on, expecting retirement and reward only from the hand of God. We may hope with Professor Freed that such conditions of work will be given them and their successors that their toil may be more effective. The conditions will need to be given; they will not be demanded; and they must be given in such a way as to protect the recipients from their own "best impulses." That is where the setting of standards by such reports as Professor Freed's is likely to prove most useful.

T. W. BALDWIN, University of Illinois

AM I GETTING AN EDUCATION?—Personal Problems Series, no. 8, Doubleday, Doran & Co. The brochure under review, which sells for the modest sum of fifteen cents, is one of an extended series of pamphlets on social, economic, and religious problems issued under the general editorship of Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page and designed for the perusal of undergraduates. The current number is a

symposium, to which Professors George A. Coe, William Lyon Phelps, and John Dewey make characteristic contributions, assisted by Messrs. F. D. Slutz and J. S. Wilson, Mr. Paul Porter, a student at the University of Kansas, and Mr. Eddy himself. The papers are all of unusual interest, and are well worth the reading of professors as well as students. They attempt to state in pointed form the objectives which the thoughtful young man should set himself. Admitting that the average college and the average college undergraduate are in a bad way, that they are confused in the designation of purposes and ineffective in their achievement, the writers of the brochure apply themselves to the task of analysis and suggestion.

In his extended essay, Mr. Eddy has given three pages to a depressing, because on the whole truthful, depiction of the intellectual and aesthetic habits displayed by college undergraduates and graduates. Their conversation canvasses no themes not canvassed by their contemporaries without college walls; their reading betrays not the slightest inclination toward the "highbrow" or indeed the "standard." Eddy quotes with approval the following paragraph from Marks' *Which Way Parnassus*:

"When most seniors graduate, they put away for the last time their mortar boards and gowns and their intellectual life with them. Books become a thing of the past. A fiction magazine or two does for reading, an occasional musical show and the movies for entertainment, women for discussion. Business, bridge, bootleggers, radio, girls, and automobiles: there is the complete list of the interests of the unmarried alumni. The list for the married alumni must be modified only slightly. For girls substitute family, and put more emphasis on radio."

The writers are at one in decrying current methods of education. The lecture system and the recitation have both proved wanting. The marking system produces cramming rather than intelligent assimilation. Lectures, recitations, and grades alike constitute barriers between faculty and students. Fellow-learners by rights, they become alienated as the examiners and the examined. In analysis of the situation, Dr. Coe charges that "students speak when they are spoken to, and the less often they are spoken to the luckier they think they are. If a student asks a question, or volunteers information, he is in danger, in some colleges, of falling under the suspicion of wanting to curry favor with the teacher. There is many a classroom in which free intellectual give-and-take between teacher

and student rarely occurs." Students fear a reduction of their grades if they venture to dissent from the point of view presented by their professors. Mr. Eddy urges that "Lecture and recitation must more largely give place to the joint quest for truth and to open discussion."

All the writers agree in regarding the professor's true function as his teaching rather than his research; the documents emanate from educationalists rather than directors of graduate study. Mr. Paul Porter, student contributor, for example, laments "that a professor's worth is gauged by the number of research articles he can produce in a given time, rather than by his ability to lead and inspire students." The graduate degree comes in for passing gibe in the essay by Mr. Slutz: "Our colleges should honor with degrees those who can produce poems. [As if those who could produce poems stood in need of degrees!] Instead, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is given to those who, lacking in creative power, become skilled in criticizing and dissecting the poems of others."

Absentee control of the colleges by trustees is decried. It results not only in an undemocratic administration, but in the predominance within the college of the capitalistic point of view. The tendency is to send out students thoroughly satisfied with the *status quo*. "A liberal education," J. H. Randall, Jr., is quoted as saying, "should aim not so much to fit us to take our places in our present world—God forbid!—as to provide us with the instruments to remake our world into something better." The administration should be changed to a "regency of tri-partite representation: students, faculty, and alumni, patrons, or the state."

Like most discussions of college problems or any problems, for that matter, the book is better on the critical than on the constructive side. Mr. Wilson's *A Constructive Criticism of Modern Education* gets little beyond vague and grandiloquent rhetoric. Mr. Slutz, decrying the division of knowledge and curricula into "departments," suggests in its stead a division (though no doubt we should not use the word) into "approachments" or "entanglements," viz., Health; Citizenship; Leisure; Vocational Adjustments; Home Establishing; and Life Philosophy—he appears to fancy that the compartmental or departmental turn of mind will disappear if only we change our array of departments or, at any rate, the nomenclature. Professor Coe takes a long look forward to a time when there shall be no more universal standards for graduation. He can imagine "commencement day transformed into an exhibit of student productions expressive of



student interest and desires, productions as varied as the personalities represented. One will be represented by a literary essay; another by a poem; another by a piece of historical or scientific or philosophical learning that he himself has dug out; a musical composition will speak for one, a mechanical invention for another, and skill in the manipulation of important processes will be duly registered."

Porter and Eddy perhaps address themselves to suggestions of more immediate application when they urge closer relation between college courses and the problems of the students' personal life and the problems of the world order. But these suggestions may be regarded as either redundant or futile; professors who are unable to give life and significance to the materials they handle are scarcely to gain the power by the reception of a hint, and those who cannot if they choose refrain from interpreting books in terms of experience stand in no need of the advice.

One would leave a false impression of the book or its purpose, however, who would speak of it primarily in terms of its counsel for the future or its advice to teachers and administrators. The book is aimed at the students; and its aim is so excellent and its analysis so frequently trenchant and true that one wishes that it might be read by the thoughtless undergraduate, who needs it, instead of the thoughtful, who does not.

It should perhaps be added that the essays by Professors Phelps (on acquiring a love of good reading) and Dewey (on Soviet education; reprinted from his series *On Russia* which ran in the *New Republic*), both stimulating, are somewhat apart in matter and tone from the remainder of the book.

AUSTIN WARREN, Boston University

## EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

THE CONVENTION OF GOING TO COLLEGE: AN APPEAL TO PARENTS.—Our passion for well-rounded education is such that we are in danger of manufacturing a nation of billiard balls. . . .

But occasionally there appear students with outstanding abilities and independent interests who ought not to be made spherical; who should be left as they are—elliptical, oblong, or triangular.

These are irregular and unusual students, and so it will be hard to speak of them in categories. But, on broad lines and with necessary qualifications, it can be said that there are four classes of college students who suffer most from the mass-production methods which American colleges have necessarily adopted to fit their students for their places in a mass-production world:

1. The true scholars—those who have a passion to go exploring in the world of ideas, tracing down the lost, mislaid, and undiscovered facts pertaining to some particular subject.

2. The adventurers—those who long to be off to explore the material world, in airplanes, sailboats, and dog sleds, following the four winds, and sitting beside each of the seven seas.

3. The artisans—those who are happiest when they are at work with their hands at tangible things, in farms, forests, laboratories, and workshops.

4. The artists—those who take joy in working with true colors, fragile harmonies, and graceful lines, striving after perfection in the creative arts.

It is to these students that the institutional training furnished by our colleges may be particularly harmful. I would appeal for them, and direct my appeal to their parents, for it is generally as a result of parental influence that they find themselves in college. In practically every case of serious maladjustment which I have discovered among college students, I have come ultimately to the statement, "I didn't really want to come to college; I just did it to please the family." It develops that the student has been persuaded into college by his parents and his contemporaries (who have in turn been influenced by their parents), and then found himself in an environment which is totally unsympathetic to him. . . .

The liberal college can develop and enrich the interests of its students in many directions. But there are some things which it cannot do: it cannot teach a boy to fly an airplane, or drive a team of husky

dogs, or breed sheep, or carve a statue. If a boy's mind is absorbed in one of these things, he will have to fight against the curriculum to find time for it. The result will often be bitter failure, both in his college career and in the private and personal career which he had imagined for himself. There are a great many places where a boy may obtain training outside the colleges. There are aviation schools, agricultural colleges, conservatories of music, training ships, art schools, and, most important of all, that almost-forgotten educational expedient, apprenticeship in the world.

As long as any non-academic interest occupies first place in a boy's scale of values he should be given "time out" to investigate it before he is sent to college. It may be that the boy will find that he is totally mistaken. A little actual experience on a farm may convince him that his interest in agriculture is not so deep as it once seemed; some time in a studio may reveal that his talent is not so great as he fancied. In that case, he can always return to college. But, until he has cleared the way for himself, and convinced himself that he belongs in college, he will never approach his college work with that singleness of purpose which brings success and satisfaction.

It is not a waste of time for a boy to spend a year after leaving preparatory school in such experiment. Either he finds that he likes his work and continues in it or he finds that he does not and comes to college without misgivings. In either case, he will have avoided the aimless and meaningless college years which are the real waste—a waste of mind and spirit, as well as time, for many students. There is much talk now of the desirability of sending boys to college earlier, but I have found that some of the best students are those who have spent some time "knocking about" in the world after leaving preparatory school.

It may seem an anomalous thing to say that the true scholar is out of place in our institutions of higher learning, but such is very frequently the case. . . . In 1895, the enrolment in American colleges was 45,000. At present it is well over 500,000. . . .

In the face of this invasion of students who had come to do anything but study, who had no understanding of the old-fashioned scholarly attitude or any sympathy with it, the colleges were obliged to create elaborate systems which would force upon these irresponsibles the required minimum of academic nourishment. . . . All this was good for the irresponsibles, but bad for the scholars, for whom the colleges were originally intended. . . . Each time he (the scholar) started off on



some new and fascinating line of independent research he found himself pulled back to earth by the necessity of conforming to the requirements.

In many colleges, better days are at hand for the scholar of this type. . . .

In Harvard College, for example, all students after their freshman year are freed from classes and lectures for two three-week "reading periods" each year. As seniors, the students are excused from classes and certain examinations during the second half of the year, when they are preparing for their general examinations. Exceptional seniors, moreover, are allowed to work at the two- rather than the four-course rate, leaving half their time free for independent work with their tutors. Similar liberty has been granted under certain conditions at Princeton, Swarthmore, and Smith. Some institutions go still further. Dartmouth, and St. John's College, Maryland, give complete freedom to certain carefully selected seniors, in order that they may devote full time to their own work. The Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin, and Rollins College, Florida, have abandoned formal lectures and classes altogether in favor of conferences, in which student and teacher may work out their problems in partnership.

The time is near, then, when the quiet boy with adventurous, scholarly tastes will be able to enter college and hope to attain that degree of fulfilment to which his abilities entitle him. But what of the others—the artist, the artisans, and the adventurers?

The artisan is the most humble and least understood of the three types of students, so I shall speak first of him. He is familiar enough in every school, and, alas, in every college. He is the tortoise of the class, who struggles wearily on before the proddings of his parents and his schoolmasters. . . .

In fact, he may be very wise about certain things, such as farms, or gasoline engines, or boats, and he can talk to you almost with eloquence about what makes the bees swarm, or what causes that splutter in your motor car, or how to shoot the sun with a sextant. If you take the trouble to ask, he will perhaps reveal to you his shy ambition to become a ranger in the government forestry service, to join the merchant marine, to be a dairy farmer, or to set up in business with his printing press.

Given the proper encouragement and assistance, or even left to his own devices, he might, in his slow, quiet, roundabout way, arrive at a

very happy and honorable career in any one of these things. But no! Family pride and the established order of things demand that he should be sent round the academic steeplechase, in the hope that he will arrive at the conventional respectability which consists in membership in the Harvard, Yale, or Princeton club, and a brokerage office downtown. . . .

Whether their interests lie in practical matters, such as the textile industry, or in impractical ones, such as ornithology, the artisans are concerned primarily with concrete things—with solving actual and not theoretical problems. . . .

There would be far less tragic work for college psychiatrists if boys of this type were set to hewing and hacking before their enthusiasms had been allowed to evaporate and their minds to turn inward, in the course of four unreal years in the thin air of college.

The problem of the adventurer is very much akin to this problem of the artisan. . . . The activities in which they are engaged call for brave hearts and ready wits, but not necessarily for academic minds. . . .

At present, for the most part, they become explorers, vagabonds, and aviators. Or would become, if, again, they had not been subjected to pressure from parents, schoolmasters, and friends to conform to the accepted notions of education. . . .

One of the greatest problems confronting the deans of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton is that of undergraduate aviators. At Princeton, the students are no longer allowed to have airplanes. At Yale and Harvard, undergraduate flying clubs flourish under very lukewarm official approval. In both communities, the clubs have become exceedingly popular. Their members are adroit and expert aviators, but, for the most part, lamentable scholars. . . .

Aviation is not the only activity which appeals to boys of this type. Expeditions of all sorts recruit largely from them. On medical expeditions up the Congo and Amazon, on geological surveys in the Alps, on game hunts in Alaska and Indo-China, on polar expeditions, and on the less pretentious trips of those vagabonds who are following the royal road to romance, some of the most able and stalwart wanderers are rebels escaped from collegiate routine. . . .

I turn to the last group with a certain amount of hesitation. The artist must not be confused with the aesthete, the amateur, or the student of art. For these last, the colleges offer many opportunities in their activities and their courses on the history and the appreciation of music, literature, fine arts, the drama, and so forth. But for those

boys who have a desire to use one of these forms of art as a creative medium the college can do very little. It is in this respect that mass methods of education fail most conspicuously, for in the creative arts the student must do much of his work alone and the rest under individual instruction.

A boy whose main interest is in striving after perfection in one of the creative arts finds himself in a hopeless dilemma if he enters college. If he devotes himself whole-heartedly to his artistic interests, he must withdraw almost completely from the social and intellectual life of the college and work by himself, in which case he will ever be in danger of discipline from the college office. If, on the other hand, he puts his work to one side for the sake of complying with the college requirements, he is in danger of mislaying his talent permanently; four years are a long time in the life of a young artist, and he cannot transfer his interest from his art to his college work for four years without suffering the consequences. It would be far better if such a boy were to omit college altogether and study under individual instruction, or at an art school or a conservatory of music.

College often mars creative artists; it seldom makes them. It appears to be true that artists develop more quickly and more completely in Grub Street than in the classroom. It was on the basis of these considerations, I think, that Harvard University allowed its school of drama to die, at the same time that it created a school of business administration. However unhappy a fact it may be, it is none the less a fact that business administration is a subject which can be taught to large groups more successfully than play-writing or any other creative art.

Why should boys of these three types ever appear in this college environment, for which they are so manifestly unsuited? Generally they come as a result of parental pressure, which derives its strength from several current misconceptions about college.

The system now in vogue at most colleges trains average people to do useful and honorable work along standard lines. But it does not encourage individuality. It helps and encourages students to follow the broad cement roads to quick and apparent forms of success, but it does not guide them along the side roads and bypaths which often lead to great and unexpected discoveries.

Most of us belong on the main road. The scholars, the artists, the artisans, and the adventurers do not. They are a small minority, but they are a very important minority. It is to them that we must look

for many of our greatest achievements. I appeal for them, because it is more important to our civilization that one potential artist like Shelley, one scholar like Gibbon, one artisan like Edison, one adventurer like Lindbergh, be kept out of college than that a thousand more incipient junior executives, Ph.D. candidates, and museum curators be let in.

WILLIAM I. NICHOLS, *The Atlantic Monthly*

QUALITY VERSUS QUANTITY IN UNIVERSITY FACULTIES.—The discussion of salaries is wasted effort unless the members of the teaching profession obtain from it a clear understanding of what they have to do, both individually and through academic public opinion, if salaries are to go up. And salaries must go up if there is to be improvement, and not deterioration, in the quality of university teaching and particularly in the quality of university teachers.

Certainly our colleagues now have generally no such effective understanding of the essential elements in the situation. Only a day or two ago I heard one of them from a sister university express appreciation of the Yale study, together with the hope that it would influence salaries at his own institution. But in the next sentence he stated, and with evident satisfaction, that in the undergraduate school of his university the tutorial system is to be introduced on a broad scale. Like the majority of our colleagues in all American colleges and universities he wants both to increase the number of the faculty and to have higher salaries. But the Yale Report in its most important, and unfortunately least-noticed, section proved with mathematical decisiveness that the reason why the enormous sums of money which are annually added to the endowment of our educational institutions produce only a sluggish upward movement of salaries is that the number of salaried teachers is increased in nearly the same proportion as are the funds available for salaries.

Higher intellectual quality in the teachers is the most important element in better teaching. No new educational devices, however meritorious in themselves, such as the tutorial system, residential halls with separate staffs, etc., can contribute to the education of large bodies of students to a degree comparable with a few able teachers. A generally higher quality can be obtained only by a much higher salary scale. Therefore, the greatest improvement in our universities involves holding the faculties at approximately their present size until funds accumulate sufficient for higher salaries. So

enormous are the sums now annually poured into our universities that there are few institutions which, if they met this condition and limited the increase in the faculty, would not be enabled within a decade to raise all salaries 50 to 100 per cent. At that higher level of salaries and ability new educational devices could be introduced with a much greater chance of proving effective than on the present level of salaries and ability.

This proposal, however, runs head on into collision with the idea, now prevalent, that college students can be taught effectively only in small classes. This idea is generally offered as the reason, or excuse, for the enlargement of the faculties to keep pace with the increase of students. Doubtless the highest grade teaching should be done in small classes or even tutorially. Doubtless the most valuable man is the productive scholar. Certainly there are many valuable teachers who lack the exuberant personality requisite to hold large classes. Yet surely not all teaching, even in the large general subjects, must necessarily be done only in small sections. If the small class, or rather the small division of all large classes, is carried much further than at present, the outlook for higher salaries is hopeless. University salaries are now at the level that mediocrity commands in other callings, and the intellectual level tends toward equality with that of salaries. The small-class idea is bringing into the faculties an increasing proportion of men who would be usefully employed as teachers in high and preparatory schools. . . .

The possibility of higher salaries, so far as the faculty can influence it, depends wholly on covering a larger number of student-hours per week with fewer, or at least without more, teachers. It is, therefore, strongly in the financial interest of the faculty as a whole to decrease the small-class type of teacher, except when he shows distinct scholarly ability, and to encourage every teacher, without increasing his courses or his hours in the classroom, to teach as large classes as he can efficiently.

But even this increase of the student-hours per teacher will effect only a sort of retail improvement in the salary situation. The wholesale side of the problem is one for which the responsibility rests on the higher executive officers and trustees of each university. There is public jubilation when funds for the addition of another school or institute in the university are announced. But for the faculty, and for those who desire improvement in the quality of the faculty, such additions should often be rather a cause of regret.



Unless there is a clear and urgent need for the education and the research which the new school or institute may afford, it inevitably does more harm than good to the university and to general cultural advancement. By enlarging the faculty it renders any future sums for raising the level of salaries and ability proportionally less effective. . . .

Let us face the facts. The universities are not now attracting ability into their faculties. Exceptions occur, but this is the rule. If the universities want a higher intellectual level, they will have to pay for it.

What, then, are the market prices of ability, mediocrity and inferiority? The Yale Report shows that, as a general rule, at least in cities where it snows in the winter and houses have to be heated, the total annual living expenses of any family are about half the sale value of their residence. This rule applies fairly closely to the various grades of professional and business men, to clerks, mechanics and laborers, as well as to professors. It rests on the facts that 20 per cent of the total annual expenditure of a household, or a little more, always goes for rent, real or virtual, and that a house or apartment rents for about 10 per cent of its sale value. Thus a man's annual salary is about half the sale price of the house he can live in comfortably on that salary, and provide for his family. . . .

Application of this principle to the present salary scales in our universities reveals the underlying cause of the increasing demand for "better teaching." This need is not met, but is rather increased, by each additional million now devoted to expansion. More teachers for smaller classes, new educational devices, additional departments, schools and institutes, larger and more imposing universities are all poor substitutes for a faculty of a high level of intellectual energy.

YANDELL HENDERSON, Yale University, *Science*

SOME RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION.—The work of the Office that may legitimately be expanded seems to me to lie in the fields of survey and investigation. A survey of the negro colleges has been completed. A survey of the land-grant colleges is in progress. We have been directed by Congress to study the secondary schools of this country, and \$225,000 has been provided for this purpose.

In this study and in other investigations undertaken by the Office of Education I believe that efforts should be directed towards dis-

covering trends and establishing techniques. In the first place, we want to be able to say to the educators of this country, whether they be engaged in private education or public education, or in elementary, secondary, or higher education, that we find the trends to be so and so. In other words, we shall do for every person who is charged with the administration of schools what the Department of Commerce may be reasonably expected to do for the business world. Let us say in effect: "Gentlemen, this is the situation, and this is the present trend, and if you see in it anything that enables you to use your school money to better advantage, well and good." After we have said that, it is no concern of the Office of Education if the State of New York acts in one way and the State of Georgia in another way. It may be that from such information the governing authorities of the Catholic Church will proceed in one way, and those of the Lutheran Church in another way. It should be a matter of supreme indifference to the Office of Education whether a school system, either public or private, acts on its findings.

The second thing I think we should do very soon is to provide some techniques or procedures by which a people, particularly a school board of laymen, may measure a school system of a community and ascertain whether it is doing the thing that the community expects it to do.

School systems are becoming very costly. I think they are going to become more expensive before they do well what the people expect them to do. We must make it possible to compare the results one community gets with what another gets for the same money or for less money. Those, I think, indicate the legitimate functions of the Federal Office of Education.

I feel sure it would be a serious mistake for us to undertake any administration of education ourselves. Let the Office interpret education, discover trends, suggest methods of study, and in occasional situations where an umpire is needed and nobody else is willing to take the risk of being killed, let us come in and serve as umpire.

WM. JOHN COOPER, *The Educational Record*

A DREAM OF FAIR EDUCATION.<sup>1</sup>—Already deafening is the din of undergraduate demands for more freedom of self-direction in choice of studies, complete freedom from petty rules and entire responsibility

<sup>1</sup> Extract

for expenditure of time on extra-curriculum activities. I, old in the business of college teaching, rejoice at the uproar and hope to hear it grow louder and more insistent because, at bottom, I am persuaded that it comes from a full appreciation of the stupidity and narrowness which have long dogged our academic ways, and yet do in many colleges and universities. Youth hates, and so do I, time-clock methods, roll-calls and the system of penalties, more than the penalties themselves, prescribed by committees on cutting. . . .

Let the student decide how much of his time shall be given to athletics and to social matters. Away with "social affairs committees" and "student affairs committees," unless the students wish to form such out of their own number for the transaction of their own business. . . . Let the college student learn by experience, and receive and evaluate the advice of his confrères and peers. And let these have the inestimable boon of learning how great the responsibility of advising others is. . . .

There is no valid reason for denying, or presuming to temper, the doctrine of freedom to choose coupled with strict accountability for the choice. The sooner the better, and the first year in college is not too soon. . . .

Once let a college come out plainly, and say to its freshmen, "You are here on your own. You are to choose among certain groups of correlated subjects offered. Find out what you can about them from those who will be your assistants rather than your teachers through college. . . . Discuss them with upperclassmen who have taken them. Follow your own inclination. Take and leave as you would in a cafeteria. Passing means being carefully examined at the end of each year. Never during the year. And each examination will cover the work of the previous year, or years. There will be no per cent or alphabetical rating, first or last. Passing means that you have done satisfactory work. Not passing means the opposite, and, in consequence, that you leave. Finally, for those who graduate there is a provision for the few who desire academic distinction. It is that at the end of one or two years you may take an examination on what you studied while in college, in the light of what you have done since, either academically, or out in the world. Passing this examination means high distinction." Once let a college say this plainly, and unflinchingly stick to it, and we shall see such education as the truly educated most desire and rarely meet with. The experiment may get its turn some day along with the endless other experiments now



being made as the result of general dissatisfaction with things educational as they are.

What part would the faculty take in this, as many will dub it, crazy scheme? A little larger and, presumably, more helpful one than in the existing status quo. First of all the faculty and the student would be installed in pleasant rooms with books pertinent to each professor's subject, a small departmental library—that black beast of college librarians. These would be augmented by reference books, encyclopedias, dictionaries, and the like at present always kept remote from classrooms. There would be no raised platforms and no formal seating. The walls would be agreeably colored, the woodwork harmonious. There would be good pictures properly framed, and other things lovely. In fine, college rooms would be humanized; fit and suitable for well-bred persons to use and not as the vast majority of them at present are the country over. Rooms which would imply that the governors of the institution realized, to the extent of action, that environment does have influence, and that spending one's time in the midst of order and beauty does affect the life lived; that it is a part of the good life which we all agree should be the aim of education.

In such rooms the faculty would meet individual students and groups for discussion and advice—discussion of subjects being pursued and advice as to where to look for the light and help of different opinions. An honors method which, undoubtedly good for the selected fraction of the last two college years, would be equally good, and come when much more needed, for the whole student body in the first two years. Further, these rooms would be working centers where the similarly interested and concerned would gather at will and by themselves for discussion.

In such a project for the life of learning, guidance and help, sought, not thrust forward, would be *magna pars*. The remainder would be incentive of freedom, of individual and common interest, of wholesome rivalry where all lines would fall in lovely rather than in dreary places. Mortality, to use a pedagogue's word, would be great at the beginning but it would be a mortality that left him who died to academe, which is not necessarily paradise on earth and certainly not the only paradise, quick opportunity to begin living to the world in some useful way and, with high probability, to an ultimately happy end. The vitality of those who continued in college would be real vitality, which means steadily increasing. . . . Thus might come into

existence a democratic college; one in which all had equal opportunity, and each was free to take or leave. One in which none remained who did not do his academic work well, and where nobody interfered directly or covertly with his apportionment and use of his own time, or variety and amount of outside activities, so long as they did not clash with the decent opinion of mankind, or the law of the land. And then might come to pass "an Alma Mater, knowing her children one by one, not a foundry, or a mint, or a treadmill."

ALFRED M. BROOKS, *School and Society*

**SALARY SCALES OF TRAINED MEN AND WOMEN.**—The organization of the Committee of One Hundred on Scientific Research at the Washington meeting marked an interesting departure from the usual policy of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. It had always concerned itself directly with the consideration of problems of research in the several sciences, but had not taken cognizance of the conditions of research. The Committee of One Hundred was organized to study the problems of the researcher. Among the several factors that weigh heavily in determining his success are those of adequate equipment, free time to devote to the work and a mind free to apply itself to the rather exacting work of research.

The situation with the academic group from different parts of the country will be indicated first. State universities, endowed universities, found chiefly in the east, colleges mainly located east of the Mississippi River and agricultural colleges from all parts of the country have been dealt with. The list is not always complete but is believed to be long enough to be fairly representative.

#### COMPOSITE FOR ACADEMIC SALARIES

	Average, Minimum	Average, Maximum	Average
President	\$7500	\$17,267	\$10,860
Professor	3462	5,568	4,425
Associate professor	2964	3,852	3,421
Assistant professor	2289	3,509	2,757
Instructor	1512	2,616	1,957
Averages for teaching faculty	2557	3,886	3,140

The average salary of a member of the teaching faculty drawn from the records of the groups here dealt with, in all sixty-eight institutions, is about \$3140. This is only an approximate result because of the small number of institutions included.

It was deemed to be a matter of importance for this study to as-

certain the rates of pay met with in one great line of business, that of the manufacturer. The scale of pay above the lower grades is considered to be significant, because up this scale the young college man must climb, and one of his great incentives in going into business is the thought that even the president's position may perhaps one day be his. In other words, the scale of opportunity in a business enterprise competes with that of the college or university in the mind of the young man laying his plans for life.

Through the great kindness of the chief executive of a well-known American manufacturing enterprise, I have been able to present here the salary scales of twenty business enterprises, a majority of them dealing with the making and selling of some kind of desired product. These enterprises range in magnitude from one having 400 employees to another commanding the services of over 35,000 persons. One does an annual sales business of three million dollars; another sells products valued at over 150 million dollars. The materials dealt in cover, among others, oil, paper, rubber goods, leather, automobiles, chains, locks, machinery, cotton, and life insurance.

SYNOPTICAL TABLE OF SALARIES IN MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES

	Minimum	Maximum	Normal
President	\$20,000	\$150,000	\$49,958
Vice-President	8,000	125,000	36,135
Treasurer	5,500	50,000	24,464
Auditor	4,500	30,000	11,579
General sales manager	\$7500 to	8,000	41,000
District manager		4,000	40,000
Salesman	\$1800 to	2,000-10,000 to 14,000	
			6,150
Works manager		8,500	27,000
Division superintendent	\$3500 to	4,500	13,500
Department heads	\$2000 to	3,500	7,500
Foreman		2,000-4,000 to 5000	
Purchasing agent	\$3000 to	4,000	25,000
Asst. purchasing agent		4,000	12,000
Employment manager	\$3300 to	3,600	13,500
Office manager	\$3900 to	4,500	13,500
			7,676

## SUMMARY

A comparison of salary scales of trained men shows rather clearly at the present time that

- (1) The pay scale of endowed and state universities and agricultural

colleges is approximately like that of the commissioned officers of the army and the navy, but lacks the advantage of the retiring pension of three-fourths pay. This pension often relieves the military and naval officer of the necessity of saving for old age. The saving required of the academic man to give him an equivalent retiring fund is not practicable at the present salary scale.

(2) It shows that the academic salary scale is appreciably lower than that of the professional and scientific services of the national government at Washington. The retiring allowance of the government employee, though small, and in part contributed by the employee himself, gives him a distinct advantage.

(3) The salaries of all groups above mentioned are very much lower than those paid in manufacturing enterprises to positions above the wage-earners.

In order to make a concrete comparison, I will enumerate the positions that on the average command salaries of \$3000, \$6000 and \$9000, respectively, in these different lines of work.

#### THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS WILL BUY

##### *A. Manufacturing enterprises*

- a. Young or unsuccessful salesman
- b. Low-grade department head
- c. Almost the average foreman

##### *B. Universities and colleges*

- a. Low-grade associate professor
- b. High average assistant professor

##### *C. U. S. Army*

- a. Low pay captain
- b. Young first lieutenant
- c. Sub-average second lieutenant

##### *D. U. S. Navy*

- a. Low-rate senior lieutenant
- b. Medium rate ensign

##### *E. U. S. Civil Service*

- a. High assistant in professional grade
- b. Low associate in professional grade
- c. High assistant in sub-professional grade

## SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS WILL BUY

- A. *Manufacturing enterprises*
  - a. Low assistant treasurer
  - b. Low district manager
  - c. Average salesman
  - d. Good average division superintendent
  - e. Good average assistant purchasing agent
  - f. Low average employment manager
  - g. Low average office manager
- B. *Universities and colleges*
  - a. Well-paid dean
  - b. High professor
- C. *U. S. Army*
  - a. Medium colonel
  - b. Well-advanced lieutenant colonel
  - c. Well-advanced major
- D. *U. S. Navy*
  - a. Well-advanced captain
  - b. Well-advanced commander
  - c. Well-advanced lieutenant commander
  - d. Very high senior lieutenant
- E. *U. S. Civil Service*
  - a. High average principal in professional grade

## NINE THOUSAND DOLLARS WILL BUY

- A. *Manufacturing enterprises*
  - a. High average district manager
  - b. Low average auditor or controller
  - c. High average assistant purchasing agent
  - d. Good salesman
- B. *Universities and colleges*
  - a. Low average president
  - b. High dean
  - c. Very exceptional professor
- C. *U. S. Army*
  - a. Little less than major general

D. *U. S. Navy*

- a. Little less than rear admiral (upper half)

E. *U. S. Civil Service*

- a. Maximum for head of large bureau  
b. Minimum for director of research in a department.

RODNEY H. TRUE, *Science*

A CURRICULUM QUESTIONNAIRE.—No one seems to believe that such a thing as a satisfactory college curriculum exists; neither do any two people agree as to the changes required to produce the ideal which all educators are seeking. The following list of questions, proposed at the Convention of the Association of University Women by Dr. Leslie R. Marston, president of Greenville College, in his discussion group on "Changes in College Curricula," provide a stimulus to fundamental thinking on the subject.

1. Has the liberal arts college a legitimate function in our educational program, or is it to be ground out of existence between the upper and nether millstones, the university and the junior college?

2. Has the liberal arts college a defensible objective in this age when the aim of life is not leisure but service and leadership?

3. Does the liberal arts college retain a unique function, or has it become a feeder to specialized schools? Has preprofessional training a legitimate claim on the liberal arts college, or should such training be organized outside the liberal arts college?

4. If the curriculum is to be functionalized, what place will be assigned to the vocational motive?

5. Does vertical expansion express the university ideal of specialization, and horizontal expansion the college ideal of culture? Or does culture demand vertical expansion supported by a broad base,—*i. e.*, a pyramidal organization?

6. Does the analogy of a series of erect obelisks hold for the usual administrative method of seeking breadth of culture by "group" requirements, with a taller obelisk representative of major concentration?

7. Are "orientation" courses in the freshman year the corrective for specialization in the later years?

8. Are not the freshman and sophomore years psychologically the specializing or particularizing years, and the later years the orientation years when relationships are discovered?



9. Should not the entire curriculum function as orientation? Is not the liberal ideal just that—orientation?

10. Does the generalizing of the first two years with specialization in the last two violate further the unity of the curriculum and further crowd out the liberal purpose?

11. Is unification secured by special departments created for the purpose? Or is unification a functional problem of the entire curriculum and not a structural problem?

12. Is unification secured by the obliteration of departmental lines? Or is there a functional pattern of the curriculum (human experience) as there is a functional pattern of the human organism?

13. What happens when we think in terms of functional centers rather than of departmental boundaries?

14. Can knowledge constitute the unification we seek today as it did in an earlier generation?

15. Is not the problem of orientation and unification one with the problem of transfer?

*Journal of the American Association of University Women*

## LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

ANTIOCH COLLEGE, COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS.—The Antioch Chapter has decided to throw its meetings open to all members of the Faculty. One meeting will be held each month devoted to a discussion of the broader aspects of educational philosophy and academic policy. The first meeting was spent in discussing the purposes and results of the Comprehensive Examinations, instituted last spring. These examinations, unlike most such with the same name, are not limited to one field of interest, the student's major, but cover in a comprehensive way the entire college course. Unlike the Pennsylvania College Achievement Tests sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation, however, these examinations stressed the ability to evaluate facts, to perceive their significance, and to relate them to one another and to general policies and attitudes. Provision was made, of course, for a more detailed examination of the student in the field of his "concentration." The examination proved most illuminating to the Faculty, whatever its effect upon the students who took it, and can hardly fail to stimulate changes both in content and in manner of teaching. In effect, such an examination provides a definition of the objectives of a college education; the examination papers cause the thoughtful teacher some searchings of heart as to the extent to which he is aiming directly at such objectives.

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—PENSIONS.<sup>1</sup>

#### *To the Academic Senate:*

Your Committee reports back the proposed plan for revision of the University Pension System as follows:

#### Recommended:

1. That all pensions be computed on the basis of two-thirds of the average professorial salary for the five years ending June 30, 1929.
2. That the present maximum of \$4000 for individual pensions from any and all sources be decreased, beginning with the fiscal year 1930-31 by \$100 per year through a period of ten years; that is, until for the fiscal year 1939-40 the maximum pension to be granted will have been decreased to \$3000.
3. That all beneficiaries of the Pension System be given the privilege of entering the Retiring Annuities System for the purpose of supplementing their pensions up to an amount not to exceed \$4000 from

<sup>1</sup> Extract from report of special Committee on pensions

the Pension source and the Annuities source combined, such privilege to become effective as of date July 1, 1930.

*Appendix to Report of the Special Committee on Pensions.*

*I. Introduction*

Your Committee on Pensions was appointed May 13, 1929, with instructions to report at an early meeting of the Senate.

The occasion for the appointment of this Committee was the withdrawal by the Carnegie Foundation of a large part of the support of the pension system for faculty members which that foundation had undertaken to carry.

\$581,920 is the present worth or capital value of the losses to the University pension fund which is involved. This sum is equivalent to \$42,809 a year for twenty years.

Hence, to cover this loss there would have to be raised either: (1) a capital sum of \$581,920 or (2) an annual sum of \$42,809 for the next twenty years.

To avoid possible misunderstanding it may be stated at the outset that those members of the faculty who are on the contributory annuity system are in no wise affected. Only those members under the pension system proper are jeopardized.

*II. Annual Cost and Present Value of University Pension System*

A pension system has now been in operation at this University for 26 years, designed, in general, to provide a retiring allowance of two-thirds of their active pay for members of the faculty reaching the age of 65 or 70 after a minimum period of service.

Such a pension system is extremely valuable. It is also expensive. During the past five years the Regents have set aside more than \$50,000 each year for pensions alone, exclusive of an annual contribution to contributory annuities which was, in 1928-29, \$76,850.45. Nor could this be the system's only source of support, for during each of these years, the supplement from the Carnegie Foundation required to make the Regent's plans effective materially exceeded the contribution of the University itself.

The relative shares of the University and of the Carnegie Foundation in the maintenance of the University Pension System prior to the current year may be stated in terms of annual contributions, or it may be more clearly expressed in terms of the present value of all University pensions for which liability has been assumed. Stated

in the second form, the present value of the University pensions may be set at \$2,159,995. Of this sum, the University, under the rules in effect up to this year, assumed responsibility for \$894,345 and the Carnegie Foundation responsibility for \$1,265,650. The Carnegie Foundation, under the old rules, thus relieved the University from a burden the present value of which was \$1,265,650 or 58 per cent of the entire present worth of the future pensions which beneficiaries of the system were, under those rules, entitled to receive.

### *III. Revision of Carnegie Rules*

In May, 1929, there were 390 persons contributing a portion of their salary in order to accumulate a retiring annuity at age 65 and 206 persons who had pension expectations. The members of the faculty who are now compelled to readjust their expectations are the 206 beneficiaries of the University Pension System who look forward to retirement at age 70 under present rules at a maximum pay not exceeding \$4000, based upon two-thirds of their average salary received during the last five years of active service. It is this group from which Carnegie contributions of a present value of \$581,920 are to be withdrawn.

### *IV. History of Pension Plans at the University of California*

The Regents originally provided for retirement pensions under Standing Order No. 174, adopted in 1903 and slightly modified in 1905. This order provided retirement benefits at age 70 for members of the teaching staff who attained professorial rank in sums equal to two-thirds of the salary for the year last preceding retirement.

Standing Order No. 444 replaced Standing Order No. 174 on March 9, 1909. By this time the retirement plan of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching had become available to the University, reducing the load upon the University budget. In 1909, therefore, the retiring age for University professors was reduced to 65 to bring the University system into conformity with that of the Foundation. The retiring allowance continued to be two-thirds of the beneficiary's salary, though calculated upon the average salary for the five years preceding retirement. The allowance of two-thirds was more liberal than that provided by the Carnegie rules but the University made up the difference.

The Carnegie grant was generously conceived but poorly administered. The Foundation found it necessary to close its lists as of

November 17, 1915, admitting no new beneficiaries after that date. In 1918 and again in 1922 it announced revisions of its rules. Distinction was now made between teachers connected with Associated Institutions who reached the age of 65 by June 30, 1923, and those who reached the age of 65 after that date. The former group was continued upon the old basis, but the retiring age for persons in the second group was advanced to 70, with allowance for a transition period, the basic salary was made the average for the last ten years of active service, and the Carnegie maximum was reduced from \$4000 to \$3600.

#### *V. Reorganization in the University Pension System of 1924*

It is evident that the changes in the Carnegie rules made in 1918 and in 1922 increased the pension load of all institutions which, like our own, had relied upon Carnegie assistance in administering a liberal pension policy. The original University pension plan of 1903 had been carried through without outside support. The University could not, however, continue alone the system of 1922 for several reasons. In the first place the faculty had greatly increased in number. In the second place, salaries had risen. And finally, longer experience and actuarial advice had informed the Regents of the financial burdens of a pension system more fully than they had been informed before.

Under these conditions the Regents indicated to the Senate in 1923 an approximate sum which they were prepared to spend for retirement allowances and asked the Senate's advice. The Senate appointed a committee and later approved the committee's report. It was, in substance, that the list of faculty members eligible for pensions be closed, and that provision for retiring allowances to new members be provided through a system of retiring annuities. For persons then on the rolls it was recommended that pensions should be continued on the basis of two-thirds of the average salary during the last five years of active service, but that a maximum of \$4000 should be established and that pensions should become available at age 70 instead of at age 65. These recommendations were accepted by the Regents and the existing system of pensions and contributory annuities was set up by order of September, 1924.

#### *VI. The Present Emergency*

Your Committee has considered several plans framed with the view of decreasing the cost of the pension system by approximately

one-half of the reduction in the Carnegie Contribution. These include:

1. Retirement, as at present, at age 70 on two-thirds of the salary of the last five years with maximum pay of \$3300.
2. Retirement at age 70 on two-thirds of the salary of the last ten years, with maximum pay of \$3000.
3. Retirement at age 70 on 60 per cent of the salary of the last five years with maximum pay of \$3300.
4. Retirement at age 70 on 60 per cent of salary of last ten years with maximum pay of \$3300.

Any of these four suggestions would divide the loss approximately as desired.

#### *VII. Plan Referred to Senate Committee*

Your Committee is of the opinion that the plan referred to it by the Senate for its consideration is better than either of the four just outlined and it returns this plan with its endorsement.

1. That all pensions be established on the basis of two-thirds of the average professorial salary for the five years ending June 30, 1929.

2. That the present maximum of \$4000 for pensions be gradually decreased to \$3000 in steps of \$100 per year over a ten-year period, beginning with persons retired in the fiscal year 1930-31.

3. That all beneficiaries of the pension system be given the privilege of entering the Retiring Annuities System for the purpose of supplementing their pensions up to an amount not to exceed \$4000 from all sources, such privileges to be effective as of July 1, 1930.

The following observations are submitted in explanation.

1. The reductions in the privileges of present beneficiaries of the University pension plan are contained in the first two paragraphs of the proposed plan. Taken together they diminish the load upon the University budget by approximately the amount of the decrease in the Carnegie contribution.

2. Although there are two methods of reduction employed, no beneficiary suffers a double cut. If the average salary for the five years ending June 30, 1929 is \$4500 or over, the \$3000 limit applies. If the average salary for this period is less than \$4500 but the average salary for last five years of service will probably exceed \$4500, the prospective pension is reduced by the change in the time base, and the additional fact of a \$3000 limit is without importance. The special advantage of the first paragraph is that it relieves the Regents from uncertainty arising from future unpredictable increases in salaries.



3. The gradual reduction of the maximum retiring allowance provided in paragraph two relieves members of the faculty on the eve of retirement who can secure little benefit from the annuities provided in paragraph three. Persons retiring prior to June 30, 1930, will be subject to the present maximum of \$4000. Those retiring between June 30, 1930 and June 30, 1931, will be subject to a maximum of \$3900, those retiring the following year to a maximum of \$3800 and so on till the \$3000 maximum is reached. Losses suffered through the operation of the declining maximum may be partly recovered by the operation of the annuity system.

4. The third paragraph contains the proposed contribution of the Regents. It provides that beneficiaries of the pension system may be given the privilege of entering the Retiring Annuities System for the purpose of making up the difference between the old expected maximum retiring allowance of \$4000 at age 70 and the new maximum of \$3000. On entering the Retiring Annuities System beneficiaries will begin to pay to the University five per cent of their salaries and the University will match this payment by an equal contribution. The arrangement will be contractual and the present rules of the Annuity System with respect to transfers, etc., will apply. The payments by the individual and by the Regents are to continue until they amount to a sufficient sum to purchase a retiring allowance which, added to the maximum free pension, will provide the beneficiary with a total income of \$4000.

5. It is estimated that the annual sum to be contributed by the Regents under the third paragraph will amount to \$26,730. Under the existing plan the Regents are setting aside \$50,000 a year to supplement the Carnegie grant in support of pensions. Under the proposed plan they will set aside \$51,724, and in addition will contribute \$26,730 to match annuity contributions in the manner specified. This is the way in which they proposed to help the faculty to meet the Carnegie loss.

6. Your Committee has considered many individual cases to satisfy itself of the probable effect of the provisions of paragraph three. In the great majority of cases members of the faculty affected will be able to secure an undiminished retiring allowance by taking advantage of the proposed system of retiring allowances. It is true that they can do this only by opening a new savings account, and that contributions to this account may be embarrassing. But on the other hand the faculty savings will be matched by Regents' contributions and

so will increase at an extraordinarily favorable rate. In case of death the accumulations go to the professor's estate, in case of transfer they go with him. In all cases except that of death the beneficiary, of course, receives the result of his and the University's accumulation only in the form of an annuity payable from age 70, never in cash except where death occurs prior to retirement, and the accumulations are paid to an estate.

#### *VIII. Conclusions of the Committee*

Your Committee believes that the plan embodied in paragraphs one to three is as good as can be devised unless and until outside help is secured to meet the loss of \$581,920 caused by alteration of the Carnegie system. It does not protect the faculty against loss. That loss occurred when the Foundation changed its basis of contribution. But it provides a way in which at least half of the loss is supported by the general University budget, it takes an additional step toward freeing the University from dependence upon Carnegie support, and it substitutes, in a measure for the pension right now possessed by the present beneficiaries of the University Pension System, a contractual interest in an annuity system which is self-financing and which is both more certain and more valuable than the system which it replaces.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO: CONVOCATION ADDRESS.<sup>1</sup>—" . . . Among all sorts of people in all kinds of places it has become the fashion to attack American education. Some criticisms one may pass by quickly as too silly to be entertained by people intelligent enough to deserve attention. One such is that higher education makes men immoral and godless. Another, closely related to the first, is that it upsets and disturbs young people. This may be phrased alternatively to read that the universities are teaching bolshevism. Although I am sure that no one here present ever held such ideas, they are by no means confined to the illiterate or the reactionary. One of the greatest scholars of the country, and the greatest in his chosen field in the world, wrote a university president of a man who was about to be made a dean, "I wish strenuously to advise you not to make this appointment; Mr. X is a man who will unsettle the minds of the young men at a time when they are most in need of settling."

This conception of education as a process of settling, of hardening, of the fixation of sound principle and righteous dogma in the youth of America brings me at once to state my own view of the purpose of uni-

<sup>1</sup> Extract from the University Record

versity training. It is exactly the opposite of that of the eminent and learned gentleman to whom I have referred. It is that the object of higher education is to unsettle the minds of young men, to widen their horizons, to inflame their intellects. And by this series of mixed metaphors I mean to assert that education is not to teach men facts, theories, or laws; it is not to reform them or amuse them or to make them expert technicians in any field; it is to teach them to think, to think straight, if possible; but to think always for themselves. If we should send a graduate of our law school to the bar who had memorized the Constitution and all the statutes and decisions in the country, I should think we had miserably failed, unless he had developed a critical faculty and a power of independent reasoning which probably could not live along with so much detailed information. By the same token a graduate of our law school who could not repeat a line of the Constitution, and had never got a case by heart would still be a product of whom we could be proud if he had found here a habit of work, an ability to handle his material, to effect new combinations, to exercise creative imagination, in a word, to think.

At every age their elders have a way of underestimating the development of the young. As a result many people seem to have the notion that the processes of education are simple and easy, that the student comes to college a sort of plastic mass to be molded by the teacher in whatever likeness he will. It is for this reason that parents have sometimes felt they could solve their domestic problems by turning them over to the educator. . . .

The college is there, with all its opportunities. Broadly speaking he may take it or leave it. And what this comes down to is that if a man has not character, if he has not the germs of intellectual interest, if he does not care to amount to anything, the college cannot give him a character or intellectual interest or make him amount to anything. It may complete the task. It is too late to begin it.

For this reason the picture of the professors of America undermining religion, communizing the sons of capital, and knocking the Lares and Penates off the shelf generally is far removed from reality. I once taught a class of college Freshmen a course called, "Introduction to the Social Sciences." But there were many aspects of the social sciences to which I could not introduce them, because they would not let me. There was only one Democrat in the class, and he battled alone against the protective tariff, with a degree of success in exact proportion to his numerical strength. The question whether vast

military and naval expenditures were necessary could hardly be raised, because everybody knew that the United States was the greatest nation on earth and ought to keep other countries in a state of wholesome awe. Suggestions that there were some slight weaknesses in the party system in this country, or in our foreign policy since the war, or that there were a few words one could say for the labor unions, were repelled as unworthy of a college professor. The social and political dogmas inculcated at the paternal breakfast table these gentlemen had accepted whole, nor were they inclined to listen to the words of an academic person as against the teachings of practical men. Under these circumstances the most that a teacher can hope to do is to galvanize or stimulate; he cannot hope to persuade. And even in the hope he is entitled to, he is frequently disappointed. The classic example is that of the Harvard professor who remarked to his class one day: "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God." And all the class wrote down in their notebooks: "Professor X says there is no God." . . .

Now you may have heard that your generation is the hope of America. Perhaps it is. Mine used to be. But if your generation makes no better use of its educational opportunities than mine has, there is little hope that the millennium will soon arrive or, if it does, that education will have been responsible for its coming. . . .

In general Santayana's description of the pupil-teacher's relationship was true of us; it was that of the cow and the milkmaid; mutual contributions may pass between them, but not conversation. The stock of prejudices we brought with us to college remained largely unimpaired when we left it. If we had our corners knocked off, it was chiefly because we were associated with a lot of bright young men who took peculiar pleasure in jumping on people for the slightest deviation from the normal. . . .

Let it never be forgotten that a university is not a collection of buildings, nor a collection of books, nor even a collection of students. It is a community of scholars. The first duty of a university is to provide those scholars with the means of life, which no university has yet adequately done, and with the means of work. If young men and women then wish to associate themselves with the scholars they must do so on the scholars' terms. They must have an abiding interest in the things the scholars have to offer them, together with the minimum intellectual equipment necessary to understand those things. The whole system of required attendance, course grades, credit hours, and

all the painful rigidities of the curriculum has grown up because the scholars, perhaps mistakenly, did not believe the young men and women had these characteristics and, perhaps mistakenly, did not have the courage to shut them out. And that system in turn has produced a vicious circle, defeating the aspiration and dulling the interest of competent and willing students, driving them forth into extra-curriculum activities, or reducing them to the motions of a spiritless routine. . . .

To the universities the nation looks for men and women who have trained minds and know how to use them; men and women who know how to think and are willing to do it. Through the fumbling futilities of American education we shall yet pass to something new, native, and vital, superior to the education of Europe, which now, perhaps through our ignorance of it, sometimes strikes envy into our hearts. And from the crass commercialism, the narrow politics, the irreligion of contemporary affairs, we shall yet pass on as well, if we can muster the intelligence for the task.

ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, SALARY SCHEDULES AND SCHEDULE CONDITIONS.—The salary schedules and schedule conditions of the Board of Trustees of The College of the City of New York shall be and remain, except as the same may hereafter be modified, amended or extended, as follows:

On and after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and twenty-eight, the compensation and salaries of the officers of the administration and instruction of The College of the City of New York shall be not less than those prescribed in the following schedules and shall be subject to the conditions indicated:

The annual increments shall be added on January 1, 1929, and on January 1st of each succeeding year.

In grades where no annual increments are specified the Board nevertheless reserves the right to assign fixed salaries to appointees in special cases when in its judgment the nature of their duties or the character of their services renders such action just.

In grades where no annual increments are specified the Board will grant annual increments in individual cases when the merit of the incumbent and the interest of the College justify it, but such increments shall not average for all the incumbents of any such grade in any given year more than \$200.



In transferring incumbents to these salary schedules from those they supersede, incumbents at the maximum of a superseded grade shall be placed at the maximum of the corresponding new grade, and incumbents below the maximum of a superseded grade shall be placed at an equitable distance below the maximum of the new grade.

In so far as the finances of the College and a suitable distribution of the staff among the grades may permit, in making promotions in rank the action of the Board will be determined by the merit of individuals based upon (a) their usefulness as teachers; (b) their productivity and standing in the world of science, letters, or art; (c) their public services, including services to the College; and (d) their executive responsibility and efficiency.

*Fellows.*—Each Fellow shall receive a salary of not less than \$600 nor more than \$1200.

*Tutors.*—Each Tutor shall receive a salary of not less than \$1200 nor more than \$2400.

*Clerical, Library, and Investigation Assistants.*—The salary of Clerical, Library, and Investigation Assistants shall be not less than \$1500 nor more than \$3000, said maximum to be reached by ten annual increments of \$150 each.

*Laboratory Assistants.*—The salary of Laboratory Assistants shall be not less than \$1500 nor more than \$2700, said maximum to be reached by twelve annual increments of \$100 each.

*Instructors and Assistant Librarians.*—The salary of Instructors and Assistant Librarians shall be not less than \$2148 nor more than \$4404, said maximum to be reached by annual increments as follows: Four of \$156 each, followed by four of \$168 each, followed by two of \$180 each, followed by two of \$192 each, followed by one of \$216. The Board of Trustees, on the recommendation of the President, may vote a further increment of \$420, and a final increment of \$300, to any incumbent who has attained special qualifications in scholarship.

*Unsatisfactory Service and Service of Exceptional Merit.*—It shall be the policy of the Board to withhold annual increments from any instructor whose services for any year are not satisfactory, and to increase the compensation of any instructor whose services for any year are of exceptional merit, without, however, thereby increasing or decreasing the sum of the increments of salary for any year. The President shall each year have made a rating of all instructors, and report the same confidentially to the Board.



*Assistant Professors and the Secretary to the President or Secretary of the College and Associate Librarians.*—Each Assistant Professor and the Secretary to the President, or Secretary of the College, and each Associate Librarian shall receive a salary of not less than \$4000 nor more than \$5592, said maximum to be reached by annual increments, as follows: Five of \$156 each, followed by four of \$160 each, followed by one of \$172. The Board of Trustees, on the recommendation of the President, may vote a further increment of \$276 to any incumbent who has attained special qualifications in scholarship.

*Associate Professors.*—The salaries of Associate Professors shall be not less than \$5500 nor more than \$7000, said maximum to be reached by five annual increments of \$300.

*Lecturers.*—The salary of a Lecturer shall be not less than \$2500 nor more than \$6000.

*Curator and Auditor.*—The salary of the Curator and Auditor shall be not less than \$5000 nor more than \$7500.

*Professors.*—The salary of a Professor shall be not less than \$6000 nor more than \$9600. It will be the policy of the Board to grant increases beyond \$7000 to Professors not heads of departments and beyond \$9000 to Professors who are heads of departments only in special cases and for exceptional reasons.

*Dean of a Faculty, Administrative and Supervising Officer or Officers in a Department of any Pedagogical or Administrative Division, Librarian, and Secretary of a Faculty.*—The salary of a Dean of a Faculty, administrative and supervising officer or officers in a department or any pedagogical or administrative division, Librarian, and Secretary of a Faculty shall be not less than \$200 nor more than \$1000 per annum in addition to the salaries of their instructional ranks.

*The President.*—The salary of the President shall be not less than \$12,500 nor more than \$18,000.

*Services on an Hourly Basis of Compensation.*—Persons appointed by the Trustees to positions in the Evening and Summer Sessions with compensation on an hourly basis shall be compensated for each hour of such service at a rate not less than one one-thousandth of the annual salary for their respective grades as established in accordance with the provisions of the other schedules herein, but the minimum hourly compensation to be paid to anyone in responsible charge of a class shall be two dollars.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY, STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTORS.—In a recent article by Merle I. Protzman a critical discussion of student ratings of instructors is given. Since the article mentioned contained certain animadversions concerning ratings obtained at Purdue University, it will not be amiss to clarify the issues involved, and also to point out some of the logical consequences of the argument in Protzman's discussion.

The study reported by Remmers dealt with the relationship between the marks assigned to students by instructors (high school and college) and the ratings of these instructors by their students. It was these ratings which were questioned by Protzman as to their validity, since they at best reveal prejudices which students have. . . . Perhaps to give the various issues as propositions stated or implied by Protzman will be the most satisfactory procedure. . . .

"It is a difficult thing to rate teachers' efficiency." . . .

This problem of measuring teaching, or, to use a simpler, clearer word, of judging or determining good or bad teaching, seems to be one of the most important problems if not the most important in the whole field of college education. An attempt at a solution was made, as Mr. Protzman suggested, by the committee of the American Association of University Professors appointed to study methods of appointment and promotion in American colleges and universities.<sup>1</sup> . . . And a comment of the committee worthy of being italicized, was: "*One could wish that it had also been revealed how skill in instruction was determined, since it remains the most difficult and perplexing subject in the whole matter of promotion and appointment.*"

"Evidence or opinion, to be of weight, must show that the person offering it is competent to judge the subject and that he is unbiased."

It is here that we disagree emphatically. It all depends upon what one proposes to do with the opinion. The Purdue Rating Scale for Instructors was not designed and is not meant to evaluate teaching efficiency from the standpoint of the administrator. It is designed to measure the students' prejudices as an important aspect of the teacher-student relationship; important, that is, in determining the learning process. From this point of view it would be a wholly illegitimate use of the scale to use it as a basis for promotion or demotion of teachers. Future investigation may show it to be more or less valid even for such purposes, but at present its only legitimate function is to enable the teacher better to adjust his procedure to that "human

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin*, March, 1929

nature" which Protzman believes to be the only constant in an educational world of change. The teacher is to see himself as the students see him.

Later in the same paragraph occurs this statement: "I think student opinion prejudiced because I think that human nature in the student is no different from human nature in general." From this it would seem to follow that no opinion is "of weight." . . .

That student criticism is of possible value, no one can deny. The extent of that value is open to question. Since experiments are being carried on at present to determine just how valuable such criticism is, it is hardly advisable just yet to condemn it by saying that students may be "either incapable of judging, or prejudiced, or both." The student's opinion is, indeed, no "absolute" criterion of teacher or material, nor should students be the "sole judges" of the material and method. Alumni opinion, when available, undoubtedly is of value; so is that of colleagues. Yet an alumnus who has specialized, say, in engineering or commerce, or chemistry may have little recollection of the teachers of subjects in which he was not primarily interested, or which were not elective, unless those teachers were extraordinarily good. That students "will pass on us favorably by seeking our product; unfavorably, by avoiding us," is not necessarily true, either, since in many institutions students, especially in the two lower classes, are assigned to courses and teachers without their wishes being consulted.

"Too much time is spent in measuring and too little in teaching."

This, of course, is a debatable proposition, but we submit that the effectiveness of teaching can be known only through some form of measurement. Merely as a matter of opinion, we believe that relatively few college teachers have definitely formulated notions of what they expect and ought to accomplish as teachers, and that at present they have rather highly unreliable means of determining the validity of their procedures and results. They will improve in this respect about to the extent to which they are able to procure valid and reliable measuring instruments.

"After all, are we not dealing primarily with human nature, taking it for granted that the facts of the subject have become part and parcel of the teacher?"

Apart from the interesting implication that teaching is merely a matter of imparting "facts of the subject," there is the further implication that the essential differences among teachers are differences in

knowledge of subject-matter. We do not deny that such differences are important. But if the implication were wholly correct, the only thing needed to obtain a precise measure of teaching efficiency would be to examine the teacher in his knowledge of subject-matter. This, again, is a conclusion probably not intended by the argument.

H. H. REMMERS, G. S. WYKOFF,  
*School and Society*

TULANE UNIVERSITY, PROPOSAL FOR INVESTIGATING VALUE OF PROFESSIONAL COURSES IN EDUCATION.<sup>1</sup>—I. *Preliminary Statement.*—At a meeting of the Tulane University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, held on February 1, 1929, the attention of the chapter was called to the increasing development of professional courses in "education," the constantly expanding legal prescription of such courses for prospective teachers in primary and secondary schools, and the general antagonistic attitude of a great number of college professors towards such development and such prescription. A member of the Tulane Chapter proposed that, as part of its chapter activity, the local membership undertake a careful and unbiased study of various aspects of this situation, to determine, if possible, if the development of professional courses in "education," naturally or by legal prescription, is genuinely promotive of the best interests of education and if the general opposition of college professors, not engaged in the teaching or promotion of such courses, is justifiable or merely reactionary and obstructionistic.

After considerable discussion it was decided, in view of the magnitude of the task, that a Chapter Committee be appointed to prepare a plan of study. To this committee were appointed Professors D. S. Elliott (Physics), Roger P. McCutcheon (English), and Marten ten Hoor (Philosophy), Chairman. This committee, realizing that the careful and unbiased investigation of this matter would be of general interest to members of the Association, and that the task was too great and too important to be undertaken by any single chapter of the Association, prepared the present communication, submitted it to the Chapter at a meeting held July 18, 1929, and recommended that it be sent to the national officers. This recommendation was accepted by the chapter and this communication is therefore respectfully submitted.

II. *Statement of Current Opinions and Convictions.*—The Chapter

<sup>1</sup> Attention is called to announcements in regard to the Annual Meeting on page 505

wishes first of all to call attention of the members of the American Association of University Professors to the following opinions and convictions, current among members of the Faculties of Colleges of Arts and Sciences and of Professional Colleges, other than Colleges of Education:

1. That the importance of professional courses in "education," especially courses in "methods," is over-rated and that prospective teachers are required to devote too much time to this phase of their preparation, to the detriment of their preparation in the subjects which they will be expected to teach.

2. That the statutes and laws, passed by state legislatures, prescribing required work in such courses, tend to over-emphasize the importance of such courses and influence prospective teachers to take such courses to the neglect of courses in the subjects which they expect to teach, especially because of the fact that in most states there are no laws prescribing the amount of work teachers must take in subject-matter or so-called "content" courses.

3. That the enactment of legislation of this type, under the direction of Departments and Schools of Education, without consultation of those who are responsible for instruction in "content" courses, is a grave mistake in educational policy.

4. That the emphasis placed upon training in methods and other professional "education" courses, in spite of the fact that legal requirements have been in force for some time, has not improved the teaching in secondary schools, as is evidenced by the fact that college entrants are no better prepared now than they used to be, this being especially true of their preparation in Mathematics and English.

5. That it is at present impossible for young men and women with the Master's or Doctor's degree, even if of exceptional brilliance and trained by the greatest authorities in arts and sciences in the country, to procure teaching positions in secondary schools *unless* they have devoted the legally prescribed time to courses in methods and other professional "education" subjects.

6. That in many institutions the appointment machinery, the purpose of which is to place teachers in state secondary schools, is controlled by the Departments or Schools of Education, and that these appointment offices consequently show a disposition to refuse, if they do not actually refuse, to recommend for positions candidates who have not met the special requirements of such Departments and Schools of Education.



7. That at the last meeting of the Association of American Colleges resolutions were introduced tending in the direction of imposing requirements in professional training courses in methods, etc., upon candidates for the Ph.D. degree, this being the first step in the direction of compelling college professors to meet requirements of the general type now imposed upon teachers in primary and secondary schools.

8. That such individuals and institutions as are of the opinion that too much time is required for professional "education" courses are absolutely helpless to attempt to bring about any modification, since the state secondary educational systems are entirely under the control of teachers, principals, and superintendents who are graduates of professional "Schools of Education," and since it is through this organization that enactment of educational legislation is influenced and controlled.

III. *Statement of Questions Which Should Be Considered.*—In view of the opinions and convictions stated above, and now held by many college professors, the Tulane Chapter requests that the American Association of University Professors appoint a committee to consider the following questions:

(a) Of what value are professional courses in "education," especially courses in methods, as at present offered by Departments and Schools of Education, in equipping a man or woman to teach High-School and Preparatory School subjects, such as English, Mathematics, Physics, etc.? Is the time spent on such courses spent to better advantage than if it were spent on a study of the subjects which the prospective teachers expect to teach? Is the time now spent on such professional "education" subjects too large a fraction of the time spent by students in preparation for teaching?

(b) Is the fundamental assumption upon which professional "education" courses are based sound, to wit, that training in methods of teaching must precede or accompany training in the acquisition of content to be taught? If so, how is it that professors of "education" do not need to take courses in the manner of teaching courses in the methods of teaching?

(c) If professional instruction in the methods of teaching is necessary, should not such instruction be given, or at least directed and controlled, by men who have specialized in the subject which the prospective teacher is expecting to teach? If, for example, a prospective teacher of English is to be given instruction in the methods of teaching English, should not such instruction be given, or at least directed and controlled, by someone who has specialized in English and who has also made some special study of the technique of teaching



English, rather than by someone who has specialized only in "methods" and other professional "education" courses?

(d) Should the Departments and Schools of Education have the exclusive right to prescribe the amount of professional "education" training a prospective teacher shall receive, as is now the case, especially in those institutions where prospective teachers are required by state law to take a degree in the School of Education? Is the present tendency to separate instruction in "education" courses and instruction in "content" courses, which is the inevitable result of the present sharp separation of the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education, sound educational policy?

(e) Has not the time arrived for a careful study of the value of methods courses and professional teacher training in general? If a careful investigation were made in a state which has for at least ten years had a law requiring a considerable amount of professional teacher training, should it not be possible to determine if the college entrants from the secondary schools of such a state show improvement in preparation over college entrants of ten years past, when no training in methods, or at least not nearly so much, was required of teachers in secondary schools?

(f) Is it sound educational policy to vest the control of appointment offices in a Department or School of Education, as is at present the case in many institutions?

(g) Is the present method of effecting legislation governing the preparation of teachers for secondary schools sound educational policy?

(h) If the general contentions of the advocates of extensive professional preparation in methods and other "education" courses are sound, should institutions of higher education not require such professional training of the members of all faculties, including the faculties of law, engineering, medicine, commerce, etc.?

(i) Has not the time arrived when this question of professional preparation should be squarely faced and a comprehensive, fair, and unbiased investigation be undertaken by such an organization as the American Association of University Professors?

IV. *Conclusion.*—The Tulane Chapter of the American Association of University Professors is convinced that an affirmative answer should be given to the last question. The Chapter feels that both parties to the dispute have, in the past, largely confined themselves to claims and counter-claims, generally taking the form of polemic. In many institutions the dispute has aroused antagonisms which have made for disharmony and disorganization of those agencies engaged in the preparation of teachers. All this can have no good effect upon the character of educational policy. Nor can it have a good effect

on the young men and women who are being trained to enter the teaching profession.

The Chapter therefore respectfully requests that this communication and petition be submitted by the National Officers to the next meeting of the Association and that, if the Council sees no serious objections, this communication and petition be printed in the *Bulletin* some time before the date of the next annual meeting.

## MEMBERSHIP

### NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following eighty-three nominations for active membership and thirty-nine nominations for junior membership are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions<sup>1</sup> and will be considered by the Committee if received before November 25, 1929.

The Committee on Admission consists of Frederick Slocum, Wesleyan, Chairman; W. C. Allee, Chicago; A. L. Bouton, New York; E. S. Brightman, Boston; E. C. Hinsdale, Mt. Holyoke; A. C. Lane, Tufts; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder, Ohio State; Julian Park, Buffalo.

W. H. Abbitt (Physics), Texas Technological  
Talbert Ward Abbott (Chemistry), So. Illinois State Teachers  
Leroy Allen (Bible), Southwestern College (Kansas)  
H. B. Arbuckle (Chemistry), Davidson  
Newton Arvin (English), Smith  
Newman F. Baker (Law), Tulane  
John D. Barnhart (History), West Virginia  
Edmond W. Beyer (Chemical Engineering), Union  
Homer G. Bishop (Psychology), Wittenberg  
Clifford H. Bissell (French), California  
Harold C. Bird (Civil Engineering), Duke  
Rae Blanchard (English), Goucher  
Mary E. Burton (English), Louisville  
Ruth C. Child (English), Goucher  
Frank Colucci (Romance Languages), Wittenberg  
Archibald Currie (Economics, Political Science), Davidson  
P. A. Davies (Biology), Louisville  
Mervin M. Deems (History), Carleton  
H. H. Downing (Mathematics, Astronomy), Kentucky  
George J. Dudycha (Psychology), Ripon  
Cora L. Durkee (English), Goucher  
F. C. Edwards (Romance Languages), Louisville  
John O. Evjen (Church History), Wittenberg

<sup>1</sup> Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Washington Office, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Marvin Farber (Philosophy), Buffalo  
H. H. Fenwick (Civil Engineering), Louisville  
H. T. Ficken (Modern Languages), Baldwin-Wallace  
Samuel T. Fife (Electrical Engineering), Louisville  
A. H. Fox (Mathematics), Union  
Arthur Hamilton (Romance Languages), Illinois  
D. Roberts Harper, 3rd (Physics), Union  
Constance E. Hartt (Biology), St. Lawrence  
Marion J. Hay (Education), Florida State for Women  
T. F. Haygood (Economics), Louisville  
Carl Henninger (Modern Languages), Texas Technological  
Harry Hill (Physics), Texas Technological  
Anthony Hoadley (Civil Engineering), Union  
Harold W. Holt (Law), Illinois  
Ernest Horn (Education), Iowa  
William R. Howell (Political Science), Washington (Maryland)  
Louise J. Hurlbrink (German), Pennsylvania State  
Robert B. W. Hutt (Philosophy), Trinity (Hartford)  
Walter H. E. Jaeger (History), Maryland  
Rudolf Kirk (English), Rutgers  
Charles T. Knipp (Physics), Illinois  
Samuel N. Le Page (History, Government), Ottawa  
Norma Le Vegue (Biology), Colorado  
James G. Leyburn (Sociology), Yale  
Albert W. Liddler (English), Antioch  
Grace E. Lippy (Biology), Wittenberg  
John Macdonald (Civil Engineering), Union  
Grover C. Mance (Geology), Winthrop  
Lelia K. McNeill (English), Wittenberg  
Clarence S. Mast (Physics), Texas Technological  
Ross Miller (Religion), Wittenberg  
Fleming G. Moore (Physics), Washburn  
Herbert Moore (Psychology), Mount Holyoke  
Ernesto Murillo (Romance Languages), Goucher  
Dorothy V. Noble (Geology), Mount Holyoke  
Joseph M. Odiorne (Biology), Western Reserve  
Gwilym E. Owen (Physics), Antioch  
Thomas R. Palfrey (Romance Languages), Illinois  
Edith Philips (Romance Languages), Goucher  
Wm. W. Pierson, Jr. (History, Government), North Carolina

Ezra C. Potter (Mechanical Engineering), Iowa State  
Charles B. Qualia (Spanish), Texas Technological  
James B. Ranck (Political Science), Hood  
W. L. Ray (Chemistry), Texas Technological  
Edward L. Reed (Biology), Texas Technological  
George A. Rice (Education), California  
Cromwell A. Riches (Political Science), Goucher  
Sidney Sanderson (Psychology), Rutgers  
Kurt A. Sepmeier (German), Wichita  
Eleanor D. Smith (History), Goucher  
Paul S. Smith (History, Government), Whittier  
George Terborgh (Economics), Antioch  
Harley J. Van Cleave (Zoology), Illinois  
Clarence C. Vernon (Chemistry), Louisville  
Bertrand M. Wainger (English), Union  
A. Doyle Waldrop (Journalism), Colorado  
David L. Watson (Physics), Antioch  
John Wilcox (English), City of Detroit  
Samuel A. Wofsy (Spanish), Wichita  
William W. Wood (Mathematics), Davidson

#### NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

Theodore R. Bowie (French), California  
Howard L. Briggs (History), Goucher  
William W. Burke (Social Work), Washington (St. Louis)  
Edward W. Cannon (Electrical Engineering), Delaware  
Robert K. Enders (Biology), Missouri Valley  
Leah Feder (Social Work), Washington (St. Louis)  
Grace B. Ferguson (Social Work), Washington (St. Louis)  
Robert T. Fitzhugh (English), Maryland  
C. R. Foster, Jr. (Journalism), Antioch  
Ellis Freeman (Philosophy), Louisville  
Otto H. Haelsig (Spanish), Wittenberg  
Ernest C. Hassold (English), Louisville  
Forrest H. Kirkpatrick (French), Bethany  
Ernest Koch (German), Pennsylvania State  
Franklin S. Lerch (Mathematics), Union  
Carl W. Lindow (Chemistry), Stevens Point, Wis.  
Thomas E. Lothery, Jr. (Physics), Davidson

Harvey B. Lovell (Zoology), Louisville  
Earnest W. Lundeen (Library), Bethany, Nebraska  
Maryan P. Matuszak (Chemistry), Wittenberg  
Charles B. Mitchell (English), Delaware  
Grace L. Moore (Psychology), Smith  
Walter L. Moore (Mathematics), Louisville  
J. W. Morgan (Chemistry), Wittenberg  
H. C. Nelson (Biology), Hendrix  
Mary Parmenter (English), Goucher  
Emma F. Pope (English), Wisconsin  
L. L. Redmond (Sociology), Kansas  
Donald C. Riley (Economics), Union  
Marguerite M. Schmidt (Chemistry), Goucher  
Daniel T. Selko (Economics), Union  
Virginia L. Smith (Chemistry), Louisville  
Dorothy Sheppard (Chemistry), Goucher  
Sylvester K. Stevens (History), Pennsylvania State  
William B. Thomas (English), Ohio State  
George J. Waskovitz (History), St. Teresa  
Rufus D. Wolff (Economics), Louisville  
Ruth E. Wright (Political Science), Vermont  
Elizabeth B. Young (Education), Goucher